National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, EDITOR. WITHOUT CONCEALMENT...WITHOUT COMPROMISE. EDMUND QUINCY, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

VOL. XIII. NO. 45. NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 31, 1853. WHOLE NO. 669.

Published weekly, on Thursday, by the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, at their office, No. 142 Nassau street, New-York. Terms, Two Dollars per annum. Printed for the American Anti-Slavery Society, by Norris & Johnston, printers, No. 21 Spruce street.

Pro-Slavery.

PROPOSED RULE ON SLAVERY.

For the Christian Advocate and Journal.

Dear Doctor: The contemplated "rule of Discipline" on the subject of Slavery is likely to do mischief on this border. We have been using efforts to quiet our people, by persuading them to believe that no such rule can be enacted by our General Conference. Our southern friends (or I might with much propriety term them enemies) have been doing their utmost to produce alarm among us, by the declaration that such a rule will be passed as shall exclude all slaveholders from the Church—that they have nothing to hope for from the North, and that the sooner we escape from the M. E. Church the better for us.

Nothing seems to me more likely than that this impolitic, uncharitable and unrighteous project, to cut off all slaveholders from communion and fellowship with the Church of their choice, if successfully carried out, will work out ruinous results to us, whom Providence has placed upon slave-territory. Our condition will be much worse than if we had been driven off with the South in the division of 1845, when we could not unite with them in the opinion that division was practicable and unavoidable, because we could not see sufficient cause or necessity for it. If the action of that General Conference had been to exclude all slaveholding members, as well as bishops and clergy, then we might have seen good cause for division; and if such rule as is at present the subject of controversy should now be passed by the next General Conference, another separation must be the inevitable consequence. We could not tamely submit; it would be entirely impracticable: for if we should determine not to enforce it, our people would not be satisfied to hold membership with a Church when a rule of the Discipline expressly forbids the connexion. Some might be disposed to succumb, while others could not; and the consequence would be endless trouble and contention, a condition of things a thousand times worse than the *evil* attempted to be cured, which evil can never be removed by such a rule of Discipline as the one in question. It must only make the matter worse; the ears and hearts of the people would be closed against us, and the chains that bind the slave riveted stronger—the prospects of emancipation more hopeless for the future. Let us alone, and the rule of Discipline as it now exists would be eventually sufficient testimony against Slavery. Moral suasion will effect more than arbitrary rule towards the amelioration of the condition of the slaves, and their ultimate emancipation. We profess to be Christians, and are willing to be governed by the law of God; but as no law is to be found within the lids of the Bible to exclude slaveholders from the Church of Christ, we cannot consent that man shall create a law or rule of Discipline to control us in this matter, limit our liberties, and embarrass us in our operations.

Let this rule be made, and we must be cut off from both master and slaves; the slaveholding territory will be placed beyond our reach, never more to be benefitted by our ministrations. Will this subserve the cause we are commanded to promote: "Go ye, therefore, and preach the Gospel to every creature?" How can we do this when we shut up our own way by a rule that is not found in the Bible? And how can we answer to the great Head of the Church for thus throwing obstructions in the way of the work that Christ has commanded to be done?

I am not a slaveholder—never have been—and never intend to be. I was born and raised in a free State, with all the prejudices of education against Slavery; and if I had never travelled in slave States, in all probability I might be inclined to think favourably of the contemplated rule; but with the knowledge I have obtained in the last twenty years in slave territory, I can never consent, or submit, to such a rule of Discipline as would exclude from the Church of God a great many of God's children, as piously devoted to his service as any to be found on the face of the earth. I believe Slavery to be an evil, a great evil, and one that ought to be opposed by all *honourable* and *prudent* means, until it shall be exterminated; but it can never be done by Church legislation, or Church action, further than what may be done by enlightening the people in reference to the evil, in a manner that may not conflict with the civil power, or attempt to ride over law and authority. This rule, in the North, where Slavery does not exist, can accomplish nothing, and in the South, it would be powerless—a dead letter; all it could possibly accomplish would be to produce contention and disunion in the Church, and have the effect of raising the standard of rebellion against the M. E. Church in all the territory of the Union south of Mason and Dixon's line. If the time should come (which God forbid) when Christian organizations divide by this line, on account of Slavery, it may not be long until our government may be divided by the same line; then "farewell—a long farwell to all our greatness;" farewell to peace and prosperity; the glory shall have departed from Church and State, and the once happy country embroiled in strife and civil war—and we shall become a weak and powerless people, by our own act of self-destruction. Let the Churches remain where they are, as one of the links that bind the confederacy together. Let us give no aid or countenance to those who would divide us; but use moral suasion, keeping before the people the evil of Slavery. Let us encourage every scheme that may tend to ameliorate the condition of the African race, and remove them to a more congenial clime, and do them all the good we can in the world, religiously and temporally. Let us do these things in a way that will not place them in hostility to the laws of the several States. By so doing we will accomplish more for God, and for the country, and for the promotion of peace and happiness, than can ever be accomplished by the present course of agitation and strife. If those brethren of the North would make a trip down this way, and spend a few years in the midst of Slavery, we have no doubt their views would be changed materially; and though they might still oppose the institution, they would be more moderate in their zeal against it, and less stringent in their plans for its extinction. They would see clearly that the *evils* of Slavery are not to be compared with the evils of immediate and indiscriminate emancipation. There are doubtless many who are slaveholders from mercenary motives—who would be exceedingly loath to give it up; but there are thousands holding slaves who would gladly give them up, if by so doing they could better their condition. The laws of the slave States require that they shall be sent out of the State when emancipated, or be liable to be taken up and sold into Slavery again; hence the way is shut up to those who may feel disposed to do anything in this respect; of two evils they choose that of holding them, as more expedient and humane than to free them, to be without protection, and liable to be taken from their wives and children, and sold into a worse bondage than the first, or be compelled to seek an asylum among strangers—to shift for themselves, which they are, in a vast majority of instances, entirely incompetent to do. The best the master can do is to turn them over to the Colonisation Societies—to which many of them would prefer to remain in Slavery—or send them into the free States, in many of which laws have been enacted to exclude them. The people of free States feel very little sympathy or good feeling for them when they are thrown among them, *except as fugitives, when their sympathies are unbounded.* It is a well-demonstrated fact that a much larger proportion of free coloured persons die annually than slaves, from the fact that they are less cared for—badly fed, clothed and lodged, and receive but little attention in affliction and distress. It appears to me that the scheme of colonisation is the most plausible one, by which much permanent good may be effected for this unfortunate race: their condition is not entirely hopeless; they have yet left them a hope in the plan proposed for their benefit by the friends of colonisation. Let them emigrate to that land whence they came, and avail themselves of those benefits and blessings provided for them by the efforts of their best friends, the philanthropists of colonisation. There they may apply themselves to the pursuit of knowledge, and the formation of industrious habits, that they may become *men*, elevated in their feelings and principles, and feel that they may have it in their power to be equal with other men. In this country this can never be their privilege; they must always feel their degradation, no matter what their circumstances may be; and this is doubtless the chief cause of their failure to do anything for themselves; in a state of freedom among the whites they are looked upon and treated as a low, degraded race. Place any people in their condition, where they cannot advance in any respect, and a similar state of things must exist.

Let those *philanthropists* of the North, who profess to feel so much interest in the poor slave, put forth their efforts to encourage and promote the scheme of their colonisation in Africa, or some other congenial clime—come up nobly to the work, lay their shoulder to the wheel, and the car will move on with rapidity—the work may be soon completed—the sufferings of the coloured race will be alleviated among us, and poor benighted Africa be civilized and evangelized.

Let our friends of the North cease to annoy and exasperate the slaveholder by hard names and abusive epithets; let them avoid sending and causing to be scattered among them firebrands and death, in the form of abolition and incendiary publications; let them come out boldly and exhibit *true philanthropy*, by aiding us in the gradual work of emancipation, and in the encouragement of the scheme of their removal, aid in Christianizing them, alleviating their sufferings, and bettering their condition in a state of freedom. In so doing they will act a more rational part, and accomplish much more good for both master and slave.

If the brethren of the North could see the baneful effects of their publications among us, they surely would not persist in their course. They should pause and consider whether or not it is desirable that another division should be made in the Methodist Episcopal Church. What good can be accomplished by it? Can we accomplish more good in a separate Church relation? Is the cause or thing contended for of sufficient importance to justify a division? If not, then refrain from the agitation of the subject; for if the rule contended for should be passed, another division must follow as a matter of necessity, with all the evils inevitably attending it. We could not live under it. But surely there is too much piety in the Church, and too much good sense, to establish such an arbitrary and unnecessary rule; or, if made, to attempt to enforce it; it could not, it would not be done. It would certainly share a similar fate with the rule attempted to be established some years ago—suspended in less than a year, and finally repealed. Rules must be made in view of the nature and fitness of things, and not by the mere arbitrary will of the law-maker. To impose a law upon a people because we have the power to do it, without a view to evil consequences which may follow, would be, to say the least of it, unwise and tyrannical in the extreme. To impose such a law as is contented for in this matter would be without reason or fitness, and could only work evil, and nothing but evil, to the Church. Let us, then, cease this strife of words, and pursue our work of spreading Scriptural holiness all over the earth—preaching the Gospel to white man and black man, to the bond as well as to the free, the people of every clime and complexion, without let or hindrance; by so doing we shall accomplish more speedily the emancipation of man from the bondage of sin and the devil, and break off the yoke which is about the necks of man—and thus bring about universal freedom; for the Saviour has said: "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to proclaim liberty to the captive, the opening of the prison-doors to all that are bound. The more pure Christianity prevails, the stronger the disposition will be to liberate the captive, and to better the condition of our fellow-man. Let this disposition work, and the work will be done better than man can do it. T. M.

The writer of the above communication is well known to the Editor. He is an itinerant minister, "a good man and true"—true to Methodism, and true to the cause of human freedom—and therefore would not contribute to the natural hindrances in the way of the Gospel, which alone can make us free indeed.

We had heretofore admonished our ultraists of the weapons they were furnishing to our "adversaries" to enable them to carry out their pro-slavery purposes along the border. The Richmond *Advocate* already assures its readers that the "Hosmerite movement" will certainly succeed. Of course our border conferences should hasten to seek protection in the Church, South! They would then enjoy peace and quietness; and preachers and people may enter, without restraint, into the slave trade; our ultraists would then have achieved a marvellous victory. It would be to them great glory to expel all owners of slaves from the Church, and cut off both slaves and owners from an Anti-Slavery ministry.

We must, however, spoil the sport both of the Editor of the Richmond and the Hosmerites. The one earnestly desires, and therefore predicts, the enactment of the excluding "rule," because he knows it would be fatal to the peace and unity of the M. E. Church; to destroy which—utterly to root it out—would give him as much joy as the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day gave his "Holiness" of Rome; and the other, because they hope to be elevated to the distinction of leaders—"they would ride on the whirlwind, and direct the storm."

Be it known, then, to all whom it may concern, that we, whose position commands a view of the whole ground, have no longer any fears or uneasiness on the subject of the "Hosmerite movement." Even from New England, and the "patron" conferences of the Northern *Christian Advocate*, we learn that the "rule" proposed will not be sustained. Even those who were inclined to favour it, at first, begin to admit it is too sweeping a measure, too fraught with danger to the Church, to be sustained by the General Conference. True, in their private communications, they ask us if something may not be done. To which we have only to reply, Propose what you think may be done in the premises, and we will calmly and candidly consider it. But give us the plan. Do not require us to pull down the old house, and live in the woods until the new edifice can be devised and constructed. On the whole, we assure our brethren that old Methonism runs deep and wide in the connexion, and that, as heretofore, an appeal to the understanding and hearts of Methodists will never fail of success. The Hosmerites will not be able to furnish a "corporal's guard" at the next General Conference.

To the brethren of the border conferences we will say, "Stand still, and see the salvation of God." Pursue with zeal and earnestness your appropriate calling; seek and save those who are lost, whether bond or free. God will take care of Methodism, while the Methodists persevere in the work whereunto they are called. Your mission is to the poor. The rich, the men of the world, may come to you, but you must not neglect the poor for the accommodation of those who count themselves above the poor, and would have our economy and institutions made subservient to their tastes, their respectability, or their worldly-mindedness. Let him who would be "wise become a fool, that he may be wise," for "the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God." One soul is as valuable in the sight of God as another, no matter what be the colour of the body in which it is lodged. It cost the same to redeem it; and your message is the same to all. Do not for a moment be diverted from your calling by this fanatic Hosmerite movement. God has not yet forsaken the M. E. Church; and the hearts of all men are in his hand. Put your trust, your abiding trust, in the God of your fathers. We are loved for the fathers' sake; and while we walk in their steps, the same Providence which opened their way will guide and preserve us to the end.—*Editor Advocate and Journal.*

Selections.

CRIME AMONG GOVERNMENT AGENTS.

ROBBING AND ENSLAVING INDIANS.

IMPORTANT REPORT FROM LIEUT. BEALE.

A report from Lieutenant Edward F. Beale, Superintendent of Indian Affairs in California, has just been made to the Secretary of the Interior, which presents such a picture of villany, cowardice and cruelty towards the Indians on the Pacific, as makes us almost ashamed of our kind. Castilianise the Anglo-Saxon names which occur in this report, and we might imagine we were reading a narrative of the barbarities practised in the first years of the sixteenth century, three hundred and fifty years ago, upon the poor aboriginals of Cuba, which so moved the indignation and pity of the benevolent Las Casas.

The Report, with a copy of which we have been favoured, shows that these poor wretches have been defrauded and robbed in the most open and shameless manner by the agents whom our government, in pursuance of treaty stipulations, had sent there to feed and to protect them. The cool confession of one of the participators in those iniquities is given in the report. But cheating is a trifle to the rest. Indians have been carried off from their homes by armed parties, and sold into Slavery; worked until exhausted, and then turned off to starve. Whole families, even tribes, have been extirpated by the miners on the most groundless suspicion of discontent—and this not in fair or open fight, but by treacherous surprises and cowardly ambuscades. The life of an Indian is of less account than that of a dog. They shoot him down in mere wantonness, to keep their hand in practice. And the officers of the government, bound to protect these defenceless natives by every consideration both of duty and humanity, can find no law which authorizes them to punish, but content themselves with shaking their heads and saying mildly that such conduct is wrong. No law in a State of the United States to punish the thief and the assassin!

But the report speaks for itself with sufficient plainness. Mr. Beale thus describes the general condition of the Indians in California, and the means adopted to relieve them:

"Our laws and policy with respect to Indians have been neglected or violated in that State; they are driven from their homes and deprived of their hunting-grounds and fishing-waters at the discretion of the whites; and when they come back to these grounds and waters to get the means of subsistence, and also when they take cattle and stock from the inhabitants for food, they are often killed, thus giving rise to retaliation and to wars; and in this way a state of things exists there which is not known in the other parts of the United States, where the Indian intercourse laws are enforced by the government, and Indian territorial possession is protected by the government.

"To remedy this state of things, and to secure to the Indians some resting-place, and to supply them with some food, and make some compensation for the country taken from them, the established policy of making treaties with them was adopted by the government, and several treaties made, all of which were rejected; so that now the Indians remain without practical protection from law or treaties, and the government officers have to do the best they can to save them from death by massacre or starvation. For that purpose the rejected treaties stipulated for '*reserves*' for the Indians to live upon, and for supplies of food; and a part of the food, in the form of beef-cattle, was immediately contracted for, and some part delivered; but in some of these deliveries great irregularities occurred (which I have heretofore communicated), to the great injury of the Indians and the government."

Here follows a specimen of the way in which United States beef was served out to the Indians by the contractors:

Official statement of Joel H. Brooks to Superintendent Beale, dated San Francisco, September 21, 1852.

"On or about the 29th August, 1851, I was appointed by Major James Savage, the Indian trader on the Fresno, to take charge of nineteen hundred (1,900) head of cattle that were delivered to the Indian agents, Barbour and Johnson, by Col. J. C. Fremont, on the river San Joaquin.

"My instructions from Savage were, that when I delivered cattle on the San Joaquin and King's river, and to other more southern Indians, I was to take receipts for double the number actually delivered, and to make no second delivery in case any should return to the band; and when to Indians on the Fresno, to deliver one-third less than were receipted for. I also had orders to sell all beef I could to miners—which I did to the amount of about $120 or $130—and to deliver cattle to his clerks, to be sold to the Indians on the San Joaquin, at twenty-five cents per pound; and I know that such sales were made to those Indians.

"In October, I received a written order from Savage to deliver to Alexander Godey seventy-eight head of cattle, to be driven to the mines, and there sold to miners and others. I was also requested, in the same communication, to destroy the order as soon as read—which was done, after I had read it aloud in the presence of Godey, P. Rainbolt, Jose de Soto, and Theodore McNabb. In November, I received a similar order to deliver to Godey four hundred and fifty head, which was done. The best of these were to be sold as soon as possible, and the remainder to be herded by Godey elsewhere. About the last of November, or first of December, I moved the cattle in my possession on to the river Fresno, and delivered to P. Rainbolt, a person appointed by Savage to receive them, eight hundred head. I also gave to Savage receipts to the number of seventeen hundred head, which I had taken from the Indians. After the cattle went on the Fresno, none were ever delivered to the more southern Indians, although I know that Tom Kit, the chief of the tribe on the San Joaquin, frequently sent after them. Some were sent to the Indians working for Savage on the "Coarse Gold Gulch," and others to stock his rancho on the San Joaquin.

"Utia had charge of that rancho, and was a partner of Savage's, and I have seen some of the cattle I had charge of in their corral."

But not only are these poor fellows driven from their homes, and reduced to starvation, but many of them are seized and forced to work without compensation, and continued massacres are going on. Mr. Beale thus writes upon this point:

"I now turn to the condition of the Indians in California, and the necessity of doing something for their relief and protection. Their condition is truly deplorable; driven from their hunting and fishing grounds, in danger of starving, many of them made to work entirely without compensation, and continual massacres going on. To give an account of all these is impossible, and I shall chiefly have recourse to official reports heretofore made as a sample of what is done, and to show the necessity of relieving them. And, first, I give an instance of this new mode of oppression to the Indians, of catching them like cattle, and making them work, and turning them out to starve, and die when the work-season was over. It relates to a scene of which there are many instances, and the knowledge of which coming to me from report, I sent out a reliable person to attend to the case. It must be added that these oppressed Indians, while actually starving to death, were only fifteen miles from San Francisco, surrounded by settlers and their stock, and took nothing. The indictment spoken of I consider as ending in nothing."

Copy of a Letter from J. H. Jenkins to Superintendent Beale, dated San Francisco, January 13, 1853.

"I have the honour of informing you that, in obedience to your letter of instructions of date December 8, 1852, I went over to the San Pablo rancho, in Contra Costa county, to investigate the matter of alleged cruel treatment of Indians there. I found seventy-eight on this rancho, and twelve back of Martinez, and they were there most of them sick, all without clothes, or any food but the fruit of the buck-eye. Up to the time of my coming, eighteen had died of starvation at one camp; how many at the other, I could not learn. These Indians were brought into this country from some place near Clear Lake by Californians, named Ramon Briones, Ramon Mesa, Jose M. Quiera, Jose Francisco, and Juan Beryessa, who have for some time made it a business of catching, and in various ways disposing of, them; and I have been informed that many Indians have been murdered in these expeditions. These present Indians are the survivors of a band who were worked all last Summer and Fall; and as the Winter set in, when broken down by hunger and labour, without food or clothes, they were turned adrift to shift for themselves, as best they could. Your timely interference in behalf of these unfortunate people has saved the lives of most of them, for Indians could not have lived through such weather as we have without any food, clothing or shelter.

"I distributed all the well among families around, who are to feed, clothe, and protect them till your further orders. I have made provision for the sick to be fed. I am happy to inform you, to show the good character of these Indians, that even when starving, and surrounded with horses and cattle, yet I heard no complaint of their stealing. These people could easily be made to support themselves, and their condition changed for the better. The grand jury of the county has found bills against these men, and I presume their trial will come on next term.

"These Indians were offered by their captors to the farmers in the neighbourhood for hire at a dollar a day; but that price was considered too high for beings so low in flesh, and rather than lower the price they were allowed to starve as reported. It is a common practice, and I know it to be such, to catch Indian children when they are out gathering acorns, and take them and hold them as slaves. Not two months ago, I was implored to restore some which had been taken from the Yo-Kei tribe in this way. I know there are a great many Indians held as slaves in this way, or taken captive in some of the forays I have described.

"By the last mail from California, I have received the following letters on the same subject. I here submit them. They need no comment:

Martinez.

"Dear Sir: I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your favour of the 15th ultimo, in which you desire such information as I may have concerning treatment of Indians in this country. I most cheerfully respond to your wishes. In the discharge of my duties as district attorney I obtained the following information, which is substantiated by reliable evidence.

"Ramon Briones, Mesa, Quiera, and Beryessa, of Napa county, are in the habit of kidnapping Indians in the mountains near Clear Lake, and in their capture several have been murdered in cold blood. There have been Indians to the number of one hundred and thirty-six thus captured and brought into the county, and held here in servitude adverse to their will. These Indians are now said to be in the possession of Briones, Mesa, and Beryessa, and sundry other persons who have purchased them in this county. It is also a notorious fact that these Indians are treated inhumanly, being neither fed or clothed; and from such treatment many have already died, and disease is now threatening destruction of the remainder. All the Indians I allude to were brought here forcibly and against their will. From my observation, that class of population who have these Indians treat them more like brutes than human beings.

"There is also a regularly organized company of persons who capture and sell these Indians, and several have lately been so disposed of to William and Ramon Castro.

"There is now pending a suit against the persons above named for kidnapping these Indians, but the statutes of this State afford no adequate protection against cruel treatment to Indians.

"Respectfully, R. N. Woods.

"J. H. Jenkins, Esq."

"San Francisco, Jan. 30, 1853.

"Sir: Information having been forwarded to me that the band of Indians on the San Pablo rancho, Contra Costa county, had been stolen off in the absence of Mr. H. B. Edwards, I informed your clerk, Mr. F. Kerlin, of the fact, and he, upon consultation with General Hitchcock, deemed the matter of sufficient importance to be taken notice of. I therefore, acting under letter of instruction to me of December 9, 1852, immediately went up to Martinez, where I supposed the persons carrying the Indians off would endeavour to cross them over to Napa county. When I arrived I was informed that the day before the two native Californians, Ramon Briones and ——— Beryessa, had attempted to pass over the bay; but as warrants were already out for their arrest, they were lodged in prison. The facts in regard to the cruel treatment of the Indians by these parties being well known, their wretched appearance whilst being driven down to the boat, so exasperated the people of the town, that only their respect for the law kept them from breaking in the prison and hanging them on the spot. There will be a term of the court next week, by which time I hope another one of the parties will be arrested.

"I found the Indians encamped at an old adobe house back of the town, and without anything to eat, and many of them sick; and in this condition they must have been driven from San Pablo. As they had shelter, I merely made arrangements to supply them with some barley, to keep them from starving till such time as Mr. Edwards arrives, which will be in a day or two. It is indeed shameful that such men as these parties should be suffered to interfere and defeat the arms of government, and exercise such cruelty towards these Indians—than whom they are but little better—and yet have no law to punish them, except for kidnapping them.

"Colonel R. N. Wood, the district attorney, informs me that there could be evidence enough had, with a little trouble and money, sufficient to convict these parties of murder. As Ramon Briones has been admitted to bail, and has friends, he may still endeavour to carry off the Indians. To guard against this I have requested several friends of mine to prevent this at all hazards.

"Hoping that what I have done may meet your approbation, I remain your obedient servant,

"J. H. Jenkins, Special Agent.

"Edward F. Beale, Esq.,

"Superintendent Indian Affairs for California."

In reading these details we derived some little consolation from the reflection that the kidnapping wretches were native Californians, and not of our own race—but the consolation was short-lived, for in the very next paragraph is recorded one of the most brutal and cowardly acts we ever recollect to have read, perpetrated by our people:

Copy of a letter from Roderick McKee, Esq., to Hon. Luke Lea, Commissioner, dated San Francisco, April 5, 1852.

"Since my regular despatch per this steamer was mailed, I have received from the temporary agent in Shasta and Scott's Valleys very unpleasant news, revealing the murder, almost in cold blood, of some thirty or forty Indians at the ferry to upper crossing of the Klamath, and at Indian Flat, two miles above, on or about the 12th ultimo. Some time before, a young Indian whom I had seen at 'Happy Camp,' in November, and had commended to the protection of Judge Roach, had, it appears, been shot by a man named Irvin R. Tompkins. He (the man shot) was connected with the Indians at the ferry, some of whom made complaints about his death, and gave some miners in the neighbourhood the idea that they (the Indians) contemplated revenge. Instead of going to the agent, who, with his interpreter, could have settled the matter amicably in a few minutes, the miners went down to 'Happy Camp,' expressed their fears, raised a party, returned, surrounded the rancheria at the ferry, and shot down all the men there, with several women; they then proceeded two miles farther up to the other village, and in like manner surrounded it, and killed the inmates. In all some thirty or forty fell. The women and children who escaped fled to Scott's Valley, where, the agent says, they are mourning the loss of their friends, and almost wholly dependent upon him for food.

"What will be the result of this breach of treaty arrangement, and most unnecessary and cruel sacrifice of life, is of course unknown; but I have fears that the law of retaliation, so deeply implanted in the Indian nature, will again overcome all prudential considerations. I have received accounts of an almost similar outrage committed by a small party of whites, upon the Indians, at Humboldt bay and Elk river, resulting in the death of some fifteen or twenty.

"There are many right-thinking, considerate men in this country, who deeply deplore this savage spirit on the part of some of the settlers; but living so far distant from the county seats, and their own lives and property at risk, they are afraid to speak out as they otherwise would.

"I will (I hope) receive further advices in a few days, and by the next mail will write you again.

"In the meantime I design appealing to the governor of the State to order a rigid scrutiny into the facts of these outrages, and take such measures as may be proper to bring the offenders to justice. In all the frontier settlements there are many men from Missouri, Oregon, Texas, &c., who value the life of an Indian just as they do that of a *cayota*, or a *wolf*, and embrace every occasion to shoot down. I despair of seeing the peace of these settlements fully established until the laws of the State are enforced; some terrible examples made; or the government of the United States send the military commandant of this division the men and means to establish small military posts to protect the Indians from such attacks."

Agent Wozencraft communicates another anecdote of the same kind, and plenty of others follow:

"Since my last report to the department, dated June 23, 1852, there has been no material change or event in the above mentioned districts of much moment, with the exception of an occurrence of rather an alarming nature—one which was well calculated to induce the Indians to break their fealty. It was in consequence of having a number of their people killed by a party of whites. This occurred within the reservation on the Fresno river, in an early part of July; and as they (the Indians) appeared to be ignorant of a cause sufficient to incite and bring down on them such summary punishment, it was well calculated to produce serious results, which in all probability would have occurred had not General Hitchcock taken active measures to prevent it.

"Immediately on learning that there was a probability of such a design against the Indians, I hastened up, with a hope of being able to prevent it; but, unfortunately the fatal act was consummated before my arrival. So hasty were they, indeed, that the Indians themselves were unapprised of the fate that awaited them.

"Most all the Indian men were absent at the time, at work some distance from home. After informing myself of the particulars, I deemed it due to the Executive of the State to inform him of the fact, as the probability was it might terminate in a war. The following is a copy:

"'Fresno River, July 13, 1852.

"'Honoured Sir: I deem it proper to inform you of a serious occurrence which has lately transpired on King's River, where a party of men are charged with having made an attack on some Indians, living within a reservation set apart for their occupancy, and having killed several of them.

"The facts of the transaction, as stated to me, are of such an aggravated nature that I deem it my duty to take cognizance of it, as the only means of preserving the peaceful relations established and now existing between the Indians and the whites; and I cherish the hope that the Executive of the State will deem it of sufficient importance to join with me in maintaining the supremacy of the law, as the only sure means of preventing the recurrence of similar outrages and preventing a war.

"Please address me at San Francisco, where I expect to be on the 16th instant.

"Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

"O. M. Wozencraft,

"U. S. Indian Agent.

"Hon. J. Bigler, Gov. of the State of California.

"*I regret to say that I have not received an answer to the above communication, and am thus left in doubt whether or no the governor deems the subject of sufficient importance to claim his attention.*

"*I returned to San Francisco with a view of having warrants issued for the accused parties, and thus bring them to trial before the federal court, but I am sorry to say that I have been disappointed.*

"*The United States District Attorney, after giving the subject that attention which its importance demanded, informs me that he was not aware of the existence of any law that would apply in the case, the federal court having no jurisdiction in cases where life was taken.*

"*The gentleman who commanded the party in this unfortunate affair was soon after elected county judge; consequently I did not think it worth while to prosecute him in his own county.*"

The above-mentioned massacre has many cruel aggravations. It was upon a "*reservation*" secured to the Indians upon the faith of the United States. It was plotted for weeks, and so well known to the whites, that news of it went three hundred miles to agent Wozencraft, at San Francisco, and he had time to get nearly to the place before it was perpetrated; and kept so secret from the Indians, that they had no suspicion until the attack was upon them. It was a massacre of defenceless women and children. The men were absent and at work; the head man, *Pasqual*, a Christian Indian and a good man, to me well known for years, being actually at work on the house in which I passed a part of last winter, at another reservation, and when he went home from work found all his family destroyed. It is a reality of the history of Logan's family; and for all this there was no redress in the country. The governor of the State did not answer the letter officially addressed to him. The United States District Attorney could find no law to apply to the case; and the leader of the massacre was elected county judge.

There are from 75,000 to 100,000 Indians in that country, and probably not a week passes in which some are not killed, or worked and starved to death. Accounts of the killings usually appear in the newspapers; and as such accounts are mostly derived from the actors, they appear as war exploits, and expeditions for which the United States is called upon to pay. The total demand for Indian wars in California, it is believed, is near a million of dollars.

I will only mention two other instances of these massacres—one the famous case of the Trinity river. This river, falling into the Pacific from the high, rugged country some distance north of San Francisco, is noted as the best in the country for salmon fish, which constitutes almost the whole subsistance of the Indians upon it. The whites took the whole river and crowded the Indians into the sterile mountains, and when they came back for fish they were usually shot; and if they took cattle, or were suspected of taking cattle, they were pursued and punished, and their villages sometimes attacked. In the spring of the last year some Indians were charged with taking cattle. A party went against a village, surrounded it in the night, attacked it at day-break, killed the whole (chiefly consisting of women and children, the men being absent) except one woman and child taken "*prisoners*," carried home a bag full of scalps—reported in the newspapers at 150, but believed to be about 180—and all without loss to themselves, which proves the character of the operation.

The second instance I will mention is this:

In a conversation on the subject of Indian affairs with General Hitchcock, just previous to leaving California, I mentioned the fact that I had seen in the papers a long and flourishing account of a victory gained by a party of whites over a tribe of Indians somewhere in the northern district, and it was from that officer I learned the following story of this affair: A party of Indian fighters had been on a long hunt after Indians and unsuccessful in finding any. Being determined however, not to come in without scalps, they sent for some Indians who were living near, to make a treaty with them. These Indians slept in the white camp that night, eating peacefully with—as they supposed—their friends. In the morning the commander of the white party ordered his men to discharge their rifles and load afresh, so that each might be sure of his gun. He then disclosed his plan; which was, that at the crack of his pistol they were to commence the massacre of their guests. The plan succeeded admirably. All the Indians were killed; and the *victors* returned with the scalps of thirty Indians to the nearest mining town, where they received an enthusiastic welcome from the citizens. This was told General Hitchcock by one of the actors in this glorious affair. At the same time a United States force of regular soldiers was in the vicinity for the purpose of chastising the Indians, should there prove any necessity for doing so.

Another instance is the following, brought by the last mail:

"*News from the Interior—Marysville.*

"A correspondent of the Marysville *Herald*, writing a few weeks since from Lyon's ranch, giving an account of an affray with the Indians, which resulted in the death of eighteen or twenty, writes again under date of 15th inst.:

"Yesterday evening, information was received that the old chief was at Frenchtown, a mining settlement across the West Branch, four or five miles distant, openly threatening vengeance upon the whites for the severe castigation they had received. A party of eight was immediately formed, and at 6 o'clock set out from Hasty's ranch, crossed the river, and arrested and brought back the old chief, arriving before 11 o'clock. After binding him, a strong guard was placed over him to prevent the possibility of his escape, until this morning, when he was removed about a mile, to Lyon's ranch; and after a short deliberation, it was unanimously resolved to hang him at once. Arrangements were soon made, and the redoubtable old brave, who has figured so conspicuously in every Indian affray of importance in this region since the introduction of the whites, after calmly surveying the preparations made for his execution, met his fate with consummate bravery. He was suspended by the neck to the limb of an oak in the neighbourhood. The vote deciding upon this course was unanimous, but there is at least one who strongly doubts the policy or justice of the proceeding. Time will show. There are still two chiefs remaining, and a tribe that can muster at least 250 fighting men, in the immediate neighbourhood of a small scattered population of exposed and defenceless whites. What course they, together with their allies, the Tigres and Nimskews, will pursue, remains to be seen."

I remark upon the above:

That no whites appear to have been killed in this "affray," where eighteen or twenty Indians were killed—a full proof that it was a massacre of helpless and defenceless beings, perhaps mostly women and children.

2. That the "old chief was at Frenchtown openly threatening vengeance." This is so contrary to Indian habits, that I set it down as an entire untruth. An Indian (and an old man at that) does not go into a town to "threaten vengeance." If he wants vengeance, he goes privately and takes it.

3. The unanimity of the vote for hanging the old man is, with me, no sign of its justice; and as for his courage in dying, that is natural to the Indian character, and especially in these California Indians, who are reduced to despair—their country and all support taken away from them; no resting-place, where they can be safe; death on one hand from starvation, and on the other by killing and hanging.

We would call the attention of the public to the quotation we have placed in italics. The agent applies to Governor Bigler for assistance in maintaining law and common humanity, and receives no answer to his communication. He endeavours to have warrants issued against the murderers at San Francisco, and is unsuccessful. The U. S. District Attorney informs him that he is not aware of the existence of any law that would apply in the case. And the "gentleman" who commanded this band of sneaking cutthroats, in what the agent calls "this unfortunate affair," is soon after elected county judge!

Lieut. Beale recommends as a remedy for these wrongs:

"1. For the immediate subsistence and support of the Indians, the sum of half a million of dollars.

"2. For their permament support and protection, military reserves, where a few soldiers can be stationed, and where they will support themselves by labour.

"3. That all the officers employed in California, in the Indian service, shall reside on these reserves, or among the Indians. I have an abode between the Mariposas and the San Joaquin, about three hundred miles from San Francisco.

"4. That the Indian agencies shall be abolished, and six sub-agents shall be appointed, at about $1500 each, to reside with the Indians, and assist them in cultivation, as well as discharging other duties."

We do not profess to be able to judge of the sufficiency or wisdom of these recommendations, but we trust the rascals who have perpetrated the unnatural outrages revealed in this report may be made to feel the full weight of the executive arm, and that soon.—*Evening Post.*

SLAVERY IN THE UNITED STATES.

At a meeting of ladies friendly to an address to the women of the United States, on the subject of Slavery, held on the 20th December, 1852, present—Mistresses Asby, Box, Coventry, Coxe, S. H. Fisher, J. J. Forster, Hanbury, Latchmore, Marten, Morland, Peacock, Perry, Pryor, Price, Reynolds, Roslyn, H. Sterry, Joseph Tritton; Misses S. A. Alexander, Allen, E. N. Cash, Cogan, C. Cogan, Dawes, Forster, German, E. Payne, Sturges, Walton, Willmore.

On behalf of the ladies who convened the meeting the following statement was read, and the address to the women of the United States, which follows, was unanimously agreed to. The following ladies have also expressed their approval:

Mistresses G. W. Alexander, Stoke Newington; R. D. Alexander, Ipswich; Burnet, Camberwell; Thomas Harvey, Leeds; Jefferson, Stoke Newington; Robert Jowett, Leeds; Samuel Lloyd, Wednesbury; Lowe, Stratford-on-Avon; Joseph Sturge, Birmingham; Misses S. A. Guest, Leeds; Esther M. Jowett, Leeds; H. Lupton, Leeds; Yerbury, Cheltenham.

"The ladies who have convened the present meeting highly appreciate the motives which led to the adoption of the address to the women of the United States of America, by the distinguished ladies who met to consider the subject at the Stafford House. They sympathize fully in the general scope of the address, and in its Christian spirit. They also desire to join in the earnest entreaty to their sisters in the United States, that they would use their legitimate and powerful influence for the removal, from their country, of an inhuman and guilty system which presses with peculiar severity on their own sex.

"At the same time, they feel that they cannot, consistently with the opinion they entertain, subscribe to the statement contained in the address, that difficulties and dangers beset the immediate abolition of the long-established system of Slavery. They know of no difficulties that can justify the delay of an act of imperative justice; while the peaceful manner in which the emancipation of a large number of slaves in the French colonies has recently taken place, with scarcely any previous notice, seems to prove the safety of immediate abolition. Similar evidence on the last named point is afforded by the results of emancipation in the British colonies of Antigua and Bermuda, where freedom was wisely given by the colonial legislatures, without the intervention of the apprenticeship system. On the other hand, it would be easy to show, from the records of acts of violence and insurrection in slaveholding communities, that the delay or the denial of freedom is the real source of danger in such countries.

"The address further speaks of the necessity of preparation for the abolition of Slavery, and of indispensable preliminaries to that event. It then proceeds, after noticing some of the dreadful abuses which exist in the forcible separation of husband and wife, parents and children, and the frequent neglect of religious instruction among slaves, to urge an amendment of the system in these respects. A consideration of the injustice of Slavery, of the natural tendency of arbitrary power to abuse, and some knowledge of its character wherever it has existed, forbid the ladies who present these remarks, to believe that it can ever be attempted with other than the most baneful effects on the happiness, morals, and religious interests of its victims. Hence they consider it an act of Christian duty, and one required by true policy, to recommend, not that one or two unsightly branches should be removed, but that the axe should be laid to the root of Slavery, as the sole means by which its bitter fruits can be destroyed. This conclusion derives much confirmation from the almost entire failure of efforts made, through a series of years, to ameliorate the condition of Slavery during its existence in the British colonies.

"It is, however, painful to dwell, even momentarily, on certain differences of sentiment between those who, in the emphatic language of the Earl of Shaftsbury, 'alike abhor and denounce, that iniquitous system of Slavery which disgraces and desolates so many regions of the civilised world,' and who equally desire its abolition. It is consoling to know that the differences are less than might at first sight appear. The noble author of the address considers that an interval of three years would be ample to make all necessary preparation for the admission of the slave to every right and enjoyment of a freeman. He says to those who may deem it right to adopt another address to the women of America, agreeing substantially with the one originally prepared—with the exception of those portions that have been indicated—'I heartily approve the course you propose. Obtain as many signatures as soon as you can to your address, which requires immediate abolition; we will do the same by ours, which requires that it shall be progressive. Encouraged thus in the course which they deem it right to pursue, as well as by the concurrence of many who have been consulted, it is hoped that the ladies present will approve the address which will be submitted for their adoption, and in such case, that measures will be at once taken to secure its very extensive signature.

"THE AFFECTIONATE AND CHRISTIAN ADDRESS OF MANY THOUSANDS OF THE WOMEN OF ENGLAND TO THEIR SISTERS, THE WOMEN OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

"A common origin, a common faith, and, we sincerely believe, a common cause, urge us at this present moment to address you on the subject of that system of Slavery which still prevails so extensively, and with such frightful results, in some of the vast regions of the western world.

"We will not dwell on the ordinary topics; on the progress of civilization; on the advance of freedom in various directions; on the requirements of the nineteenth century; but we appeal to you very seriously to reflect, and to ask counsel of God, how far such a state of things is in accordance with His holy Word, the inalienable rights of immortal souls, and the pure and merciful spirit of the Christian religion.

"We are not insensible to the difficulties that the abolition of Slavery in your country may encounter, from supposed pecuniary interests and long-cherished prejudices; but, whatever difficulties may exist, we believe it to be a Christian duty to terminate, without delay, a system which deprives man of his rightful freedom; withholds from him the just reward of his labour; and which, both by law and in practice, in direct contravention of God's law, 'instituted in the time of man's innocence,' denies, in effect, to the slave, the sanctity of marriage, with all its joys, rights, and obligations; which separates, at the will of the master, the wife from the husband, and the children from the parents. Nor can we be silent on that awful system, which, either by statute or by custom, interdicts to any race of man, or any portion of the human family, education in the truths of the gospel and the ordinances of Christianity.

"We appeal, then, to you as sisters, as wives, and as mothers, to raise your voices to your fellow-citizens, and your prayers to Almighty God, for the removal of those calamities and crimes from the Christian world. We do not say these things in a spirit of self-complacency, as though our country had been free from the guilt it perceives in others. We acknowledge with grief the heavy share we have had, as a nation, in this great sin. We acknowledge that our forefathers introduced, if they did not compel, the adoption of Slavery in some of your States. We humbly confess this before Almighty God; and it is because we so deeply feel the share which our ancestors have had in this iniquity, and on account of the deep injury to the interests of humanity and Christianity involved in its continuance, that we now venture to implore your aid to wipe away that which has been our common guilt and our common dishonour."

The following ladies were appointed a committee and secretaries:

Miss FORSTER, Tottenham.
Miss E. N. CASH, Peckham.
Mrs. PRYOR, Bedford-Square.
Miss TRAVERS, Champion Hill.
Miss LATCHMORE, Peckham.
Mrs. REYNOLDS, Hart Street, Bloomsbury.
Miss RHODES, 10, Forest Place, Walthamstow.

Secretaries.

Miss SARAH ANN ALEXANDER, Stoke Newington.
Miss COGAN, Walthamstow.
Mrs. S. HORMAN FISHER, Manor Road, Stamford Hill.

The secretaries will be glad to receive communications, addressed to 5, Bishopsgate Street Without.

The committee appointed to obtain signatures to the above address have circulated it widely and received a considerable number of signatures. If there are yet some places where neither of the addresses to the women of America have yet received much attention, they would respectfully invite the immediate co-operation of friends residing in such places.

The foregoing circular we insert at the request of the Secretaries; it points out *one* defect in the "Stafford House" document, and the correspondence below discloses *another*, not less important, and calling for correction; one indeed, that the American slaveholder and his clerical apologists are not only found continually harping upon, but, strange to say, one that has also been entirely overlooked by the great bulk of even the most zealous and intelligent Abolitionists in these kingdoms. We therefore direct the special attention of our readers to this subject, and ask them ever to bear in mind the undeniable fact disclosed by this correspondence, that so, in all time coming, they may be able to deprive the apologists of American Slavery of one of their strongest grounds of defence, and thereby help to propel the great cause of ultimate emancipation. We have the pleasure to know the writer, "a worthy son of worthy sire," and it affords us no small satisfaction to find him thus devoting his attention to a cause which, for many years, engaged the energies of his revered father, the late Robert Grahame, of Whitehill, in this city; our first chief magistrate under the Burgh Reform Act, and the friend and coadjutor of Thomas Clarkson.

SLAVEY IN AMERICA.

To the Committee of Ladies taking charge of the Address by "The Women of England to the Women of the United States of North America," on the subject of Negro Slavery.

Ladies—I take the liberty of transmitting to you a copy of a letter addressed by myself to the Right Honourable the Earl of Shaftesbury, as to certain of the allegations in your address to the women of America, with a copy of the publication referred to in that letter in proof of my statements.

If my statements are correct, the paragraph in your address on which I comment should at once be expunged. We have no occasion to exaggerate the crime of England towards our African brethren or our brethren of the United States of North America.

I am, with the highest respect, Ladies, your most obedient servant, THOMAS GRAHAME.

Hatton Hall, December 10th, 1852.

To the Right Honourable the Earl of Shaftesbury, &c. &c.

Hatton Hall, Wellingbrough, Northampton, Dec. 10, 1852.

My Lord—Permit me to call your attention to a serious error in the address prepared by your lordship, as from the "women of England" to the "women of the United States of North America," on the subject of Slavery in those States.

The women of England thereby acknowledge with "grief and shame, England's heavy share in the great sin of American Slavery, and they affirm that our forefathers introduced, nay, compelled the adoption of Slavery in the United States, humbly confessing this fact before Almighty God, and unfeignedly avowing this complicity, they implore the aid of the women of America to wipe out the common crime and dishonour."

Now, my Lord, these statements are altogether unfounded; they have, it is true, been again and again repeated by American writers, but without proof other than their mere assertion—hence your Lordship's mistake. Not a single petition or remonstrance was ever addressed by any one of the North American States to the British Government against the introduction of negro slaves, or the perpetuation of negro Slavery in these States. Previous to the American Declaration of Independence, no power existed with the English Crown or Government to prevent any one of the North American provincial governments from abolishing Slavery within their limits, thus putting an end to Slavery and the slave trade. No one of these governments availed themselves of this privilege, nor were they prepared or disposed to make the sacrifice it inferred.

No sooner had the North American provinces established their Independence, and freed themselves from British control, than they legalized the Slave Trade, and permitted, by the enactment of their independent legislature, the importation of negro slaves to people their free soil, and that for a period of twenty years succeeding the establishment of their Independence.

I send herewith to your Lordship a copy of a publication, issued as far back as 1842,* proving the entire untruthfulness of the American apology for American accession to negro Slavery, which, on the faith of American writers, your Lordship has engrafted on the address by our English countrywomen.

The publication in question is from the pen of the late James Grahame. No one admired more than he did America and its institutions, and no one who reads his *History of the United States of America* but must acknowledge, as Lord Mahon remarks in his *Constitutional History of England*, that Mr. Grahame was "Americanus Americanior." The facts stated in Mr. Grahame's publication are undoubted.

It is in the spirit of truth, and in no spirit of national self-complacency, as if our English nation was guiltless, that I address your Lordship. Such a spirit (in all circumstances erroneous) would, in the present instance, be more than ridiculous.

Fifty years have not elapsed since our legislature made the question, not of slavery, but of the slave trade, a consideration of Commercial policy, and twenty have elapsed since the stain of Slavery has been scarcely eradicated from our Institutions. Hence, my Lord, we have no room for boasting.

I am, with great respect, my Lord, your most obedient servant, THOMAS GRAHAME.

The preceding letters are circulated in the interest of truth and justice.

The philanthrophic intentions of the noble lord who framed, and of the ladies who adopted, the address commented on, cannot be injured—they must be forwarded—by the correction of an error so important as that pointed out in these letters.

The correction of this error takes from the American supporters of Slavery and slave-holding their strongest plea in extenuation of the national crime. The Americans, as a nation, are equally responsible for the perpetuation of Slavery and the slave trade in their republic. They have, indeed, abolished a foreign slave trade, but they permit and protect a domestic slave trade on their own free soil. T. G.

Hatton Hall, December 28th, 1852.

* *Cursory Review of American Apology for American Accession to Negro Slavery*, by James Grahame, Esq., author of the *History of the United States of America.* Smith, Elder, & Co., Cornhill.

From The Liberator.

REPLY OF WENDEL PHILLIPS, ESQ., TO HON. HORACE MANN.

BOSTON, March 21, 1853.

WM. L. GARRISON, Esq.—*Dear Sir:* Were my spirit such as Mr. MANN describes, I should answer him in the same temper in which he addresses me. The materials are ample, far more ample than he imagines. To such an one as he fancies me, they would be tempting. I shall not touch them. I retain, however, the right to remember the spirit and tone of his letters as facts from which to form, in future, my estimate of his character. If my Speech or letter had any force, it came from the facts I stated, not from the epithets in which they were wrapped. I shall observe that rule now, and commend it to Mr. MANN for adoption.

Mr. MANN is much excited by my speaking of his past relations to the Anti-Slavery cause. He says I have not stated the facts correctly. I have looked over my statement, and re-affirm it. I leave that statement and his denial to the judgment of the Anti-Slavery public, and shall cheerfully abide the verdict. He considers my reference to these facts unnecessary personality. I do not think so. He had claimed, in his first letter, that his services to the Anti-Slavery cause had been so marked, and his course so decisive and outspoken, that I was not justified in suspecting him of want of frankness, even if his language looked like it. This claim might possibly have some weight with those as young in the movement as himself. I felt bound, therefore, to show that his past history and conduct had been such that I had no reason to be *surprised* at his course in Congress, or to hold back from the judgment to which his language naturally led. Words take much of their hue from the character that stands behind them.

Mr. MANN is equally offended with my rebuke of him five years ago, in regard to the Coloured School question. He says that I 'came up stealthily behind him, and struck him dastard blows, when the planning and execution of a great educational enterprise was confided to his hands, and he was encountering the opposition and hostilities of selfishness in a thousand forms.' I hardly know what he means by '*stealthily*' and '*dastard*.' I never have had the pleasure of any personal acquaintance with Mr. MANN, and hence could not address him privately. Besides, he was the Officer of a Commonwealth of which I was a citizen, and entitled, therefore, to criticise his public acts through the press. I published my remarks in *The Liberator*, the appropriate organ through which to arraign any man who commits a crime against the coloured race. I should have been glad to have printed them in the *Daily Advertiser* or *Boston Atlas;* but Mr. MANN knows well they would not publish a line from me. I gave my remarks, therefore, all the publicity I could. So much for '*stealthily*.' As for the *time* I chose, I can only say, I criticised his Reports the moment I saw them; and, in one case, the moment his Report was out of the press. In those very criticisms, I spoke with admiration of his 'devoted zeal and untiring labour as Secretary,' and expressed my 'deep sympathy in all his efforts and trials.' For some twenty years, the cruel, degrading, injurious, and utterly illegal system of separate schools for coloured children—the result of American prejudice against colour—had prevailed in our cities and large towns. A few of us had been besieging, for some ten years, Legislative committees and City committees, to get such schools abolished. In our almost hopeless efforts, we had borne the insults of politicians and the jeers of the press; but still, at great cost and effort, we persevered. All this while, Mr. MANN was the head of the School system of Massachusetts, and it was suspected that, in private, he entirely agreed with us in our views. Such an officer we had a right to expect would lead our van. Such, I knew, was the state of public opinion in the rural districts, that a few pages in his Annual Reports would be a mighty help to us. Instead of this, he never gave us one word of recognition, countenance or aid. At last, when he did speak on the subject at all, his language was calculated to do so much harm, that I felt called on to protest against it.

I knew he had a great educational enterprise on his hand. I thought that he fancied he should increase his ability to serve that, by smothering his convictions as to the wrong done the coloured man. This false philosophy was all I charged him with. I never charged him with personal or low ambition. But when Mr. MANN has been longer acquainted with the Anti-Slavery enterprise, he will learn that we never grant any one leave to sacrifice the *rights* of the coloured man, in the idea of being thereby better able to benefit the white; leave, that is, to do evil that good may come. This is the universal excuse for not helping the slave. Many a man says, 'If I touch the slave question, I shall be less able to serve my church—my party—my business—my college,' &c. &c. For this, we have criticised WEBSTER and BEECHER—even ADAMS, RANTOUL, and HALE. What claim had HORACE MANN to be an exception? He will observe that I did not bring this old matter forward till he forced me to do so by his allusions to the past

This is no personal matter between Mr. MANN and myself. It is a grave charge of serious misconduct in public office. The separate Coloured School still exists in Boston, with all its cruel, degrading, and injurious effects. How much of the guilt of its continuance is chargeable on HORACE MANN's silence, not to use a stronger term, no one can tell. The criticism of the Anti-Slavery press was not lost. He has since taken a coloured girl to board at his table. She was a student at the Normal School, and no other family in the village would admit her. I have known this fact for some time. I mention it with pleasure. All honour to Mr MANN for it. None but an American knows how much honour he deserves for it. He will live to repent yet of the wrong he did the coloured children of the State, by his systematic and designed silence. I have so much confidence in his magnanimity as to believe he will yet confess that repentance.

Mr. MANN asserts that I have not quoted his speeches at sufficient length to do him justice. I do not think your readers will blame me for not quoting enough. I used your columns as liberally as I dared. However, his volume may be found at all the bookstores, and is, as its eloquence and masterly logic well deserve, in the hands of many Abolitionists. Any one can easily satisfy himself whether I have done Mr. Mann any injustice. There is one paragraph, a few lines of which I omitted, to save space, giving notice by astericks that parts had been omitted. He says if I do not now quote this in full, it will be because I dare not. Why did he not copy the paragraph himself, since your columns were as open to him as to me for such a purpose? However, to gratify him in every particular, please copy, in a note hereto, the paragraph on his 206th and 207th pages, first as I quoted it, and then as it stands in his volume.* Every one, who will take the trouble to compare the two, will see that the omitted lines do not change the sense in the slightest degree. In this paragraph, uttered in 1850, Mr. Mann declares that '*The Constitution of the United States, and the law of* 1793, *being at an end, the law of nature revives. By this law, every case of an escaping slave is but the recovery of stolen goods. When they cross the line into a free State, they are free—as free as you or I.* THE STATES BEING SEPARATED, I WOULD AS SOON RETURN MY OWN BROTHER OR SISTER INTO BONDAGE, AS I WOULD RETURN A FUGITIVE SLAVE. BEFORE GOD, AND CHRIST, AND ALL CHRISTIAN MEN, THEY ARE MY BROTHERS AND SISTERS.'

I understand this to mean, that, until the States were separated, his conduct would be different; else why make the condition? Every man whom I meet understood it so. I doubt whether, of his thousand readers, Mr. Mann can find one who did not so understand it. He affirms he did not mean to be so understood. I can only say that, with Mr. Mann's wonderful control of language, it is marvellously strange that he should, on this occasion, have succeeded so poorly in conveying his meaning. In 1850, Mr. Mann avowed, as I have shown by abundant quotations, that the Constitution ordered the return of fugitive slaves; a doctrine to which, if I understand his last letter, he still adheres. In the same speech in which he made this avowal, he, page 182, classes himself with those whose '*allegiance to the Constitution is unshaken*'; and again, in the same speech, he uses this language—p. 213:

'Two things exist at the North, which the South does not fully appreciate—the depth and intensity of our abhorrence of Slavery, and that reverence for the law which keeps it in check. We are a law-abiding people. But, *release us from our obligations, tear off from the bond with your own hands the signatures which bind our consciences* and repress our feelings, destroy those compensations which the world and which posterity would derive from a continuance of this Union, and well may you tremble for the result.'

What does Mr. Mann mean by human law keeping his abhorrence of Slavery in check? I trample in the dust every human law that would check my abhorrence of Slavery or of any wickedness

Is he a 'law-abiding' man in the sense of obeying any law which upholds Slavery? Can any human *bonds* or *signatures bind* a man's *conscience* to do wrong—to return slaves? This speech, he says, was addressed to the South. Does any one doubt how Southern men understood such language, wholly unqualified?

Afterwards, in that same year, 1850, *while speaking of the Fugitive Slave Act, and of its violating the Constitution, by denying jury trial*, he said:

'I disdain to avail myself, in a sober argument, of the popular sensitiveness on this subject; and I ACKNOWLEDGE MY OBLIGATIONS TO THE CONSTITUTION, WHILE IT IS SUFFERED TO LAST. But still, I say, that the man who can read this bill without having his blood boil in his veins, has a power of refrigeration that would cool the tropics.'

What does this mean, if it does not mean that he will obey that clause of the instrument which orders fugitive slaves to be returned?

With such printed pages before me, not to speak of others, I assert that I was fully justified in charging him with a willingness to return fugitive slaves to their masters, while the present Constitution lasted.

He now withdraws and repudiates this sentiment. I am glad of it. If he ever held it, I am glad he repents. If he has been grossly misunderstood, the fault is his own, and he should thank me for calling his attention to it, and giving him an opportunity to explain himself.

In regard to my quotations to show that Free Soilers have no wish to interfere with Slavery in the States, and 'consent to let Slavery remain where it is,' Mr Mann says I do him injustice, because they were all 'spoken in his capacity as a Congressional legislator, or with reference to legislation by Congress.' He is incorrect here. The quotation which I made before, from page 212, says, the South 'complain of Northern agitation on the subject of Slavery, and Northern instigation of slaves to escape.' This is not party agitation, political agitation, legislative agitation, but Northern agitation. He speaks, too, of 'instigating slaves to escape.' From this, it is evident that he had the whole movement on his mind, and not its 'legislative' aspect alone. For when did anybody ever 'complain' of *political parties* or *legislatures* 'instigating slaves to escape?' The next sentence speaks of 'agitation,' putting the word between quotation marks. Now, everybody in the free States knows what that term means; knows that it describes the *whole* Anti-Slavery movement, moral as well as political. It is in this sense, also, that Mr. MANN himself uses it, on his 392-3-4-5th pages, commenting on Webster's impudent declaration, that 'agitation must be put down.' Yet he says, 'They [the North] have never *agitated* the question of Slavery in the States.'

If all this, not to adduce other passages, does not mean what it appears to, the public have a right to ask Mr. MANN to be more careful, in future, to express exactly what he does mean.

But granting Mr. MANN spoke those passages only in his Congressional, legislative, political capacity, they prove exactly what I charged. My original language was—

'The same speech contains the usual deprecatory assertions, that Free Soilers have no wish to interfere with Slavery in the States; that they 'consent to let Slavery remain where it is.' If he means that he, HORACE MANN, a moral and accountable being, 'consents to let Slavery remain where it is, all the rest of his speech is sound and fury, signifying nothing. If he means that he, HORACE MANN, *as a politician and party man*, consents to that, but, elsewhere and otherwise, will do his best to abolish this "all-comprehending wickedness of Slavery, in which every wrong and every crime has its natural home," then he should have plainly said so. Otherwise, his disclaimer is an unworthy trick, which could have deceived no one. He must have known that all the South care for is the *action*, not in what *capacity* the deed is done.'

I did not say JOSHUA R. GIDDINGS, CHARLES SUMNER, or HORACE MANN 'had no wish to interfere,' &c., but these gentlemen AS FREE SOILERS, i. e., acting in their Congressional, legislative, party capacity. And I charged further, that Mr. MANN was not explicit in letting his hearers know in what capacity these humbling and crippling words were said, and how far they bound him. He thinks he has been sufficiently explicit, and refers the reader to his whole volume. So do I—and cheerfully abide the verdict of any one who will read it with care. But, mark! *he now confesses that he does hold himself bound, as a* CONGRESSIONAL LEGISLATOR, *not to interfere with the subject of Slavery in the States, and as such, 'consents to let Slavery remain where it is.'* This I consider the great weakness and mistake of the Free Soil party. The Constitution, as it stands, gives no power to interfere, directly, with Slavery in the States, except, in J. Q. Adams' opinion, when some crisis in war shall make it necessary. The opinion of so eminent a statesman, as able a judge of Constitutional law as we have ever had, is reason enough why an Anti-Slavery legislator should never assert, in unqualified terms, that we have no right to interfere with Slavery in the States. Let us hold on with tenacious grasp, and keep constantly familiar, every, even the slightest claim we have to such an interference.

But, in excusing himself for his official oath, Mr. Mann says, 'I do not swear to support the Constitution in any such sense as forbids my *doing all I can* to alter it. In that office, I have better means of changing it.' Now, how is the Constitution to be altered? By *Congressional Legislation.* Congress proposes amendments, and submits them, for ratification, to the States. This right draws after it the political right to 'agitate the question of Slavery in the states,' which Mr. Mann so carefully repudiates. At the ballot-box, in political conventions, in Mr. Mann's place in Congress, a man can 'agitate' to have the President chosen for life, to abolish the war-power of Congress, to have women vote, to abolish Slavery in the States. The whole question of Slavery in the States is open, therefore, to every political man in the Union. Mr. Mann is young in the Anti-Slavery cause, or he would have learned the distinction we have always made between *legislation* and *agitation.* No one, except Gerrit Smith's party, has ever claimed the right to *legislate* on State Slavery, while the Constitution remains as it is But, in defiance of Henry Clay, in 1839, and both the pro-slavery parties, we have always claimed the right to 'agitate the question of Slavery in the States,' even on the floor of Congress, in our political capacity, as well as in every other. To be sure, the attempt to alter the Constitution, in this respect, is about as hopeless as the purpose which some Free Soilers avow, of altering its three-fifths slave basis of representation. Both are equally hopeless. But the right to stir them is invaluable. Why, then, this perpetual harping, by Free Soilers, on the impossibility of their saying this and the other thing, or avowing this or the other purpose, in their *political* capacity? I assert that a Free Soiler, no matter where he stands, in Congress or out, can honourably make every effort and avow every purpose that an Abolitionist can, except the effort and the purpose to disobey the Constitution as it stands. That glorious right constitutes our peculiar privilege, and whenever any Free Soiler uses it, he stamps himself as foresworn. Up to that limit he can go, and is bound to go; and whenever he fails to do so, he fails in his duty to the slave Most of the political Abolitionists, who talk so much of 'political capacity,' and 'under the Constitution,' do it to propitiate public sentiment, knowing well enough, all the while, what their rights and what their designs are. In this description, I by no means include Mr. Mann. Such men know that, even under the present Constitution, were it possible Free Soilers should ever get the rule, our Federal government, by indirect influence, could in various ways interfere with Slavery in the States. Let it establish the perfectly constitutional rule, that no slaveholder should ever be appointed to National office, and there are States where such a course would kill Slavery in five years. Sagacious men of the party know this, and intend to adopt it whenever possible. Yet they go about, and allow their confederates to go about, disclaiming all wish to 'agitate Slavery in the States,' and all right to interfere with it there If they mean what they say, it is treason to the slave; if they do not mean it, it is hypocrisy. What is the crowning argument always used even by Free Soilers, with Northern audiences, to make them ask for the abolition of Slavery in the District, and of the internal slave trade? That such acts will materially affect Slavery within the States. With what truth, then, can the representatives of that party assert, that, in any sense, it 'consents to let Slavery remain where it is,' or deny that it 'agitates the question of Slavery in the States?

Even in the above mentioned paragraph, Mr. Mann shows his heedlessness or insufficient information. He deliberately enumerates the objects which Northern agitation has sought to compass, and twice asserts that those he names are the *only* ones ever attempted. Yet, not to mention the sanctity of the public mail rifled by slaveholding committees, and other smaller matters, we do not find in his list the abolition of the Internal Slave Trade, a subject on which we have petitioned Congress for years, and one which every Abolitionist, till within a few years, and almost every one now, deems to be within the legislative control of Congress. Neither do we find in his list the abolition of the three-fifths slave basis of Representation, a question on which Adams and Giddings have given us the ablest State paper ever written on political Anti-Slavery. I allude to their Report to the House of Representatives in the year 1844. This has been an aim of every political movement against Slavery, from the Hartford Convention, in 1814, down to the organization of the Free Soil party, which adopted and ably argued it at first. Could Mr. Mann find no place, in his list, for that one bright spot in Northern statesmanship, the sunset glory of old Federalism, Rufus King's movement in the Senate of the United States, for the abolition of Slavery itself? I beg, for the honour of the North, that he will inform himself better, before he undertakes again to recount its Anti-Slavery history.

We come now to the question of Free Soilers swearing to support a Constitution which orders the return of fugitive slaves. And here Mr. Mann, as is usually the case with his friends, becomes confused and obscure. I asked him the plain and direct question, whether he held that the Constitution did order such return. *This question he has not answered.* But I infer, from the general tenor of his letter and argument, that he now holds, as he always has done, that the Constitution does so order, and that Free Soilers generally agree with him This being premised, let us see what he says, in his first letter, of this Constitutional oath:

'I know of no Free Soiler who has ever felt any trouble on that score, or has ever been "slow to meet the question." And this, *for the simple reason that we swear to support the Constitution of the United States, because, with our interpretation of it, it requires us to do nothing in violation of the Higher Law of God.*'

Why insert the phrase, '*with our interpretation of it*,' since it now appears that their interpretation is the common one? It misled me, I confess, into supposing that Mr. MANN had adopted Mr. LYSANDER SPOONER's view. It seems he had not, and the words are superfluous. But I call the attention of the Anti-Slavery public to the sentence above, in italics. Mark—he says he 'knows of NO FREE SOILER.' This includes the Free Soil voter, the Free Soil Representative, the Free Soil Senator, the Free Soil candidate for President. That Free Soil voter is liable, at any time, to be called by the United States Marshal to help him capture fugitive slaves; or if as some think, that duty belongs to the States, the State sheriff may call on him for the same purpose; and the voter being in some States under an express, and in all, under an implied oath to the Constitution, is legally bound to obey. That Free Soil Representative, in his place in Congress, votes to pay the Marshal, who has done that service to the State, and the Judge who issued the precept. The Free Soil Senator is one who appoints Judges for that purpose. The Free Soil Candidate for the Presidency, when he accepts the nomination, avows that he is ready to take the office of appointing such Judges and such Marshals, and of executing, with the whole military power of the nation, that clause of the Constitution, if it be opposed. Mark, also—it is no matter whether, in such offices, they intend actually to do these deeds. Mr. MANN cannot deny that these are deeds which the Constitution 'requires them to do.' Now Mr. HORACE MANN tells us, that all these persons find no difficulty 'in swearing to support the Constitution, because with their interpretation of it [which is the usual one], IT REQUIRES THEM TO DO NOTHING IN VIOLATION OF THE HIGHER LAW OF GOD.'

I call on the whole North and the whole South to get this confession by heart, and fling it in the face of every Free Soiler who shall hereafter undertake to talk of the *sin* of returning slaves into bondage.

Again, after some distinctions about his own oath, which I shall presently notice, Mr. MANN says, in his last letter—

'I swear as a Member of the House of Representatives, not as a United States Marshal or foul Fugitive Slave Law Commissioner. When Free Soilers are found taking an oath which shall oblige them to return fugitive slaves, then let them be blasted with the swiftest lightning.'

Last fall, Mr. MANN voted, I presume, for JOHN P. HALE for President. It matters not to the responsibility of a voter, whether his candidate be elected or not. He does all he can to elect him, by giving him his vote. At the same time, Mr. MANN himself consented to receive the votes of his party for the office of Governor of Massachusetts. Now, if the Supreme Court is right, Mr. HALE, if elected President, would have been bound to appoint Marshals to execute the slave surrender clause, and to execute it himself, if it were resisted. If that Court is wrong, and the Free Soilers are right, holding that the clause refers to the States, and needs no auxiliary legislation, then Mr. MANN, if Governor, would have been bound to see it obeyed. You will please observe, that I am not supposing either of these men would actually do such an infamous deed. I only assert, in Mr. MANN's language, that their respective *oaths would oblige them to do it.* In voting, then, for Mr. HALE, Mr. Mann asked his friend to take 'an oath which obliges him to return fugitive slaves.' On the other supposititiion, in consenting to stand as Governor, he offered himself to take such an oath, if his fellow-citizens should elect him. Now if a Free Soiler, who takes such an oath, should be 'blasted with the swiftest lightning,' how swift ought the lightning to be for one, who, by his vote, asks his friend to take it, or for one who offers to take it himself? My moral optics are not, I confess, sharp enough to see much difference. Mr. Mann will please observe, that I have not been speaking of the *Fugitive Slave Act*, whose constitutionality he and I should deny, but of *the constitutional slave cause itself;* and my whole argument refers to that. It is evident that, allowing, as Mr. Mann does, that there is a fugitive slave cause in the Constitution, it must be executed by somebody in some form or other. If by the Union, then, in voting for HALE, Mr. Mann asked his friend to be, in fact, Chief of 'United States Marshals and foul Fugitive Slave Law Commissioners.' But if that duty belongs to the States, then, in offering to become a State Governor, he offererd himself to become virtually, a Marshal or Commissioner for this purpose

Of his own oath as Member of the House of Representatives, Mr. Mann says he considers it *special*, and not GENERAL; referring only to the duties of that office. To this well-known distinction, I do not wholly assent; but I cheerfully accept it for the purpose of the present argument. If, for the last two years, Mr. Mann has voted for the usual bills appropriating money for the expenses of Government, he has voted to pay Marshal Devens for carrying Thomas Sims from Boston back to Georgia, and to pay the salaries of Peleg Sprague and B. R. Curtis, who tried Elizur Wright and other alleged rescuers of Shadrach. If he has ever voted for an appropriation bill, during his whole Congressional life, he has voted to pay the salary of one Judge McLean, a Western miscreant, who is rarely heard of except as sending back some hapless fugitive, or fining, into absolute poverty, some Christian who has helped the wanderer. Whether it is more honourable to return slaves one's self, or to pay other men for doing it, Mr. Mann can decide at his leisure. The old saw, *Qui facit per alium, facit per se*, I hold to be good logic and good Latin—though as to the last, having Webster's fate before my eyes, I will assert nothing just now. If Mr. Mann shall allege that he has never once voted for an appropriation bill, then he has broken his oath; for he has failed to do that which the Constitution and common honesty required him to do; namely, pay the salaries of men, who according to the Supreme Court, the established final interpreter of the Constitution, had done only their legal constitutional duty. Mr. Mann can choose either horn of the dilemma he prefers.

I had affirmed that an oath to the people of the United States was binding in that sense in which he who took it knew, at the time, that the people understood him to offer it. This familiar principle is sanctioned by every moralist, from half-Christian Cicero down to half-pagan Wayland. Mr. Mann denies it! He asserts that as an 'oath makes God a party to the transaction, it is binding in that sense in which he knows the party took it!' This is virtually the Jesuits' rule, that promises are binding, not as the parties understood them, but as the promisor secretly intended. That is, a man may swear one thing and mean another, and God justifies him! I do not so hold, neither will M. Mann, when he thinks of it a second time.

Mr. Mann, next says that his 'guides to duty are his conscience and his Maker.' Had he been holding a discussion with Brownson, the remark would perhaps have been pertinent, though somewhat trite. Nobody this side of Rome ever denied the proposition; certainly, I never did. If he will read my letter more carefully—which I beg him in future to do—he will see that I never asked him what his 'guides to duty' were. I did ask him how he reconciled himself to his Anti-Slavery principles, in swearing support to a Constitution which he allowed to be pro-slavery. I must say, I do not think I have yet succeeded in obtaining much of an answer.

The Constitution I take to be a list of principles, conditions and agreements. Whoever, on reading, assents to them, and can honestly promise to put them into execution, is qualified to take office under it. The Government is a whole, a unit—all its parts intimately connected. One can hardly take the humblest office in it, without becoming partaker in the responsibility of every other. The Supreme Court is established as the final interpreter of the Constitution? and every man who swears to support and execute it, swears to do so in the sense which that Court has declared to be the true and legal sense of the instrument. This doctrine Webster engraved on the political tombstone of Hayne and Nullification. When Mr. Mann is ready to 'throw himself right across that path,' and dispute it, I shall be happy to listen to him, if I have time. Meanwhile, he asks, confusedly, what one shall do if the Supreme Court changes its decision, or what in case the people and the Court differ. I will not show such disrespect to his character as a lawyer as to suppose that he really thinks these questions deserve an answer.

I maintained that Mr. Mann's oath or promise was made to the nation, and binding on him in the sense in which he knew the nation understood it.* To this he answers that 'Howell Cobb and Lynn Boyd understood perfectly well in what sense I would take the oath, when they called me to the Speaker's desk and administered it.' Howell Cobb! Linn Boyd! These may be very worthy individuals; but I never heard that they were authorized to dispense with the oath prescribed by the Constitution, and administer a new one. Mr. Cobb was appointed to administer the oath, not to explain, qualify or new shape it. Mr. Mann knows that, as well as Howell Cobb or myself His office was purely ministerial. It might have been performed by an automaton. Indeed, the whole thing might have been completed by the sign of Mr. Mann's dropping a white ball into a deal box. Mr. Mann goes on—'All the nation, and the Supreme Court, who cared to know, knew as well as they did. At any rate, it was not my fault if they did not know; I had told them often enough.' I can hardly bring myself to believe that Horace Mann, the author of that masterly argument against the Fugitive Slave Law, ever penned these sentences in serious earnest. Like poor Moses Stuart, had he no friend to prevent his jesting so untimely? How Webster would have snatched at such words from Horace Mann to prove the contemptuous assertion, that 'his opinion on a law question was not worth regarding!'

But let us look back a moment. Mr. Mann has just been telling us that his *special* oath, as member of Congress, did not bind him to do anything as to fugitive slaves, or do anything wrong. What occasion, then, had he to enter into any explanations with those worthy individuals, 'Howell Cobb and Linn Boyd?' What occasion had he to 'tell' so 'often the nation and the Supreme Court' 'in what' particular 'sense' he took the oath? He has been asserting all along before, that he took it just as every body else did; and he made himself rather merry at my not being aware of the 'plain and palpable legal distinction' which covered all members of Congress. But now, behold, even this special oath is of such a nature that he is obliged to have some private understanding with Mr. Cobb and Mr. Boyd. This is very singular. Will Mr. Mann please let the world know what little function there was which other members of the House promised to fulfil, but which he privately begged 'Howell Cobb and Linn Boyd' to excuse him from?

Seriously, I mean to assert that, up to this moment no man in this Commonwealth, or elsewhere, had any reason to know or think, from any public word or act of Mr. MANN, that he took that oath with any qualification or reservation, or in any sense peculiar to himself. I respectfully ask Mr. MANN to point me to the passage of his printed speeches, where he gives any frank expression of his unwillingness to take the oath to the Constitution in the usual sense. GERRIT SMITH may take this position of public notice; LYSANDER SPOONER may take it. They have spoken boldly, long and loud about it. I do not discuss, now, whether it be tenable.

But if Mr. MANN finds, in defending his oath, that he must needs assume it, I deny that his past course entitles him to any such defence. *His claiming it shows me that he cannot, to his own satisfaction, defend his oath on the ground* which he tries to silence me with, namely, that the oath is *special*, and not *general.* Was I indeed so very far wrong in saying that Mr. MANN lacked frankness?

Mr. MANN says—'If it be true that a promise is binding in that sense in which the promisor knows the promisee understands it, it is just as true, whatever words may be used, that a promise is no further binding than as the promisee knows the promisor understands it.'

Very true. I thank him for the terseness of the statement, and think I can show him, in this connection, his mistake about the oath. I will talk to him as a lawyer. He knows that a sealed instrument can only be avoided by a sealed instrument, one contract by another of equal solemnity. He is aware, also, of the common principle, that a judge, for instance, may know a fact in his private capacity, which he is not bound, or indeed authorized to know, or take notice of, in his *official character*, till it is proved to him by competent legal evidence. Now, in the matter of the oath, Mr. MANN is the promisor, and the nation is promisee. Mr. MANN knows, by *official acts*—the Constitution and Supreme Court—acts he is *legally bound to know and notice*, how the nation understands his oath. Can he show that the nation knows, by any *official acts* of his—*acts of which the nation is legally bound to take notice*—in what new or particular sense he accepts the oath? When he can, I will allow that he is justified in taking an oath to the Constitution, meaning to obey only a part of it.

An oath to the Constitution is a promise to the nation. It is made, not to Howell Cobb or Linn Boyd, but to me and to you—to Benton in St. Louis—to the merchant on the New Orleans levee—to the squatter in Wisconsin—to the planter on the banks of the Roanoke and the Altamaha. It was agreed on in 1787. Then Massachusetts and Carolina came together. They agreed to entrust their common interests, peace and war, commerce and manufactures, to joint representatives. On what conditions shall we do this? said they to each other. On condition, said Carolina to Massachusetts, that you send no man into the general council, who does not first agree to be bound and limited by this Constitution, the whole of it. It was so settled, and they parted, one to her rice swamps, and the other to her fisheries; each at liberty to devote herself wholly to her own business, and not obliged to watch perpetually the other's action, sure that no man would be allowed to touch the general Commonwealth, who had not first consented to the settled limitations.

Now, look at Mr. MANN's theory, and let us test it. He explains to his constituents at home, that when he swears to support the Constitution, he means to support all but one clause. They accept him with that understanding, and send him to Washington. He goes to the Speaker's desk to take the oath. Before doing so, he informs the Speaker of the sense in which he takes it. What would be the Speaker's duty? He would say—'Mr. Mann, officially, I cannot notice your scruples. Here is the oath, I am not here to construe it. You know what the Court says it means. If you are ready to take it *as it stands*, I am ready to administer it. To change it in the least is to make it another oath. The law tells me to administer *this oath*, not any other.'

But, says Mr. Mann, my constituents elected me knowing that I would not take the whole oath. I have talked about it 'so often,' that almost everybody knows it.

The Speaker replies—You might have whispered your explanations to your wife, or written and deposited them in your boots, just as well as have printed them in the *Dedham Gazette* or *Boston Commonwealth* You know such publication is no legal notice to the nation. As the old English speaker said, 'I have no eyes here but the eyes of the House'—can see nothing but what the law sees. I cannot notice explanations. As for your constituents, they got all their right to choose you from the nation; and the nation never gave them a right to choose any man, except one who consented to the *whole Constitution.*

So, Mr. Mann sits down, and I (who had watched the experiment with some interest—for if it succeeds, who knows but I might get sent to the Great and General Court from some come-outer town on the Cape?) come up and whisper in his ear that, after all, the Speaker is right. For what is Mr. Mann attempting to do? To get released from a part of the original promises; since his oath is not just what Fisher Ames's was. Well, this may be done, provided the other party to the promise consents to release him. But who is the other party? Not his constituents—not the Speaker—not the Supreme Court—*but the Nation.* When and where, then, has the Nation (Illinois, for instance, as one part of it) consented that Mr. Mann shall construe the oath to suit himself, or take part of it, and leave the rest?

To justify himself, Mr. Mann must, I think, show one or two of the following three things:

1st. That the Nation has officially released him from some part of the oath. Or,

2d. That the Nation allows him to construe the oath and the Constitution to suit himself. And

3d. That he construes the Constitution to be Anti-Slavery throughout, and so can honestly undertake to execute the whole.

On any other theory, what check has South Carolina over Mr. Mann's constituents, with whom she has shared her sovereignty? Her only check is the oath, in its full, natural, and pre-determined sense. Any other theory destroys the Government. My old, valued and noble friend, Gerrit Smith—a name never to be mentioned but with profound respect—goes into Congress, holding himself entitled to use his powers, as legislator, to abolish Slavery in the States—to let women vote—to annihilate the war powers of Congress. On the same principle, another man may go there to change the republic to a monarchy. What does Mr. Mann think of this? His theory of private interpretation—agreement with constituents—understanding with Howell Cobb—covers all this, if it covers anything. The Constitutional oath is like the moral law. If you can once get the point of a needle through it, the same hole will accommodate a six horse coach.

Mr. Mann indulges in epithets and insinuations which may 'catch the ears of the groundlings,' which it would not become me to notice.

Yours, respectfully,

WENDELL PHILLIPS.

P. S. I shall hold it a kindness if those Editors, who copy Mr. Mann's letter, will find a place also for this.

* For the extracts here referred to, see close of the letter.

* Mr. Mann is somewhat earnest about accuracy of quotation. Let him 'reck his own read.' I never said, as he represents me, that promises or oaths 'are binding in that sense in which the nation understands them,' or that the 'oath is binding according as the nation and the Supreme Court construe it.' I said, 'A promise is binding in that sense in which the *promisor knows* the promisee understands it.' Mr. Mann is clear sighted enough to see the distinction.

EXTRACT FROM MR. MANN'S SPEECH.

THE paragraphs referred to by Mr. Phillips, in the second column of the preceding letter to Mr. Mann, are as follows:

Mr. Phillips' Quotation.

'An outside belt or border region of the slave states, no part of which shall be more than one hundred miles from a free frontier, would embrace nearly one-half of their whole area; and as I suppose, much more than one-half of their whole slave population. What is to prevent the easy escape of slaves living within these limits? While God sends nights upon the earth, nothing can prevent it. I venture to predict, that in such a state of things, slaves will become cheap, and horses will become dear. I am aware of our laws which forbid slaves to cross bridges or ferries, without a pass; but you can have no law against seasons of low water. The old adage says, 'riches have wings.' You will find that these riches have legs. The Mississippi and Ohio rivers, where they border upon free states, will be alive as with shoals of porpoises. *Remember there is no Constitution of the United States now. That you have broken. The free States are, therefore, absolved from all obligation to surrender fugitives. The law of 1793, is at an end....... The Constitution of the United States, and the law of 1793 being at an end, the law of nature revives.* ...... THE STATES BEING SEPARATED, I WOULD AS SOON RETURN MY OWN BROTHER OR SISTER INTO BONDAGE AS I WOULD RETURN A FUGITIVE SLAVE. BEFORE GOD, AND CHRIST, AND ALL CHRISTIAN MEN, THEY ARE MY BROTHERS AND SISTERS.'

Mr. Mann's Paragraph.

First, as to the recovery, or non-recovery, of fugitive slaves, which is one of the alleged provocatives of dissolution. Take a map of the Southern States, and spread it out before you. Although they cover an area of about nine hundred thousand square miles, yet it is a very remarkable fact, that only an insignificantly small portion of this vast extent lies more than two hundred and fifty miles from a free frontier; and those parts which do lie beyond this distance hold but few slaves. Those portions of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Tennessee, where there upper boundaries converge among the mountains, are a little more than this distance from a free border: but this territory is relatively insignificant in size, and sparsely populated with slaves. An outside belt or border region of the slave States, no part of which shall be more than one hundred miles from a free frontier, would embrace nearly one-half of their whole area; and, as I suppose, much more than one-half of their whole population. What is to prevent the easy escape of slaves living within these limits? While God sends night upon the earth, nothing can prevent it. I venture to predict, that in such a state of things, slaves will become cheap, and horses will become dear. I am aware of your laws which forbid slaves to cross bridges without a pass; but you can have no law against seasons of low water. The old adage says, 'riches have wings.' You will find that these riches have legs. The Mississippi and Ohio Rivers, where they border upon free States, will be alive as with shoals of porpoises. Remember there is no Constitution of the United States now. That you have broken. The free States are therefore absolved from all obligation to surrender fugitives. The law of 1793 is at an end. No action can be maintained for aiding them to escape, nor for harbouring or concealing them. The distinguished senator from Kentucky [Mr. Clay] said, in his late speech, that no instance had ever come to his knowledge where an action for harbouring runaways had not been maintained in the courts of the free States, and damages recovered. But this remedy you will have annulled. The Constitution of the United States, and the law of 1793, being at an end, the law of nature revives. By this law, every case of an escaping slave is but the *self-recovery of stolen goods.* When they cross the line into a free State, they are free—as free as you or I. The States being separated, I would as soon return my own brother or sister into bondage, as I would return a fugitive slave. Before God, and Christ, and all Christian men, they are my brothers and sisters. As our laws make it piracy to kidnap slaves in Africa, or to ship them thence, so it shall be a felony, punishable with death, for any southern master to kidnap a coloured man, in a free State, or transport him from it, on the ground of alleged ownership. You are fond of quoting Scripture to us, in justification of Slavery. We will retort the Scripture, that 'he that stealeth a man, and selleth him, or *if he be found in his hand*, he shall surely be put to death.'

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

*** *All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns should be addressed to* SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, *New-York.*

†‡† *Donations to the Treasury of the* AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY *may be forwarded to* FRANCIS JACKSON, *Treasurer, at Boston; or to* SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, *New-York.*

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 31, 1853

☞ We copy from *The Pennsylvania Freeman* the following statement as of special interest to the members of the American Anti-Slavery Society. Mr. Johnson will come into the office of the Society in May

STATEMENT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

It becomes necessary for the Executive Committee of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society to announce to their constituents an unexpected change in the editorial department of *The Pennsylvania Freeman.* They have been induced to make this change by a strong conviction that the interests of our cause require it. The Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society have invited OLIVER JOHNSON to become one of the Editors of *The National Anti-Slavery Standard*, and requested us to release him from his engagements with us, in order that he may accept this appointment. The reasons which have induced them to make, and us to grant, this request, are, that the editorship of *The Standard*, and the proper management of the American Society's Office in New York, require the presence of more than one efficient Editor and Agent; and that OLIVER JOHNSON possesses in a remarkable degree the qualifications for sharing these responsible duties. A careful consideration of these reasons, and a deep conviction of their importance, overcomes the strong reluctance which we feel at parting with a valued friend and coadjutor, whose labours as Editor, and in whose counsels and assistance as a member of our Executive Committee, have been highly esteemed by our friends and constituents, and have, undoubtedly, promoted the Anti-Slavery enterprise in Pennsylvania. We believe, however, that fidelity to our cause leaves us no alternative but acquiescence: and as the promotion of the interests of the American Anti-Slavery Society is the promotion of our cause at large, we doubt not that Pennsylvania will reap her full share of the advantages to be derived from this new arrangement, and be amply compensated for any present regret she may feel in its adoption.

We are happy in being able to announce as Mr. Johnson's successor, one whose fidelity to our cause has been long tried and fully proved, and to whose industry and ability as Editor, the readers of *The Freeman* will testify; CYRUS M. BURLEIGH. His long personal experience in the Anti-Slavery enterprise, his intimate acquaintance with its history from the commencement, and his knowledge of the peculiar wants of Pennsylvania, inspire the Committee with confidence that he will fill the editorial chair with satisfaction to the readers of *The Freeman.*

JAMES MOTT, *Chairman.*
HAWORTH WETHERALD, *Secretary.*

EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES.

At a Stated Meeting of the Executive Committee of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society, held February 8th, 1853, the following letter was received and read:

To the Executive Committee of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society.

DEAR FRIENDS: Having concluded, in accordance with your judgment and with your consent, to accept the invitation of the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society to become Joint-Editor with Messrs. Gay and Quincy of *The National Anti-Slavery Standard*, I now offer my resignation of the editorship of the *Freeman*, and of my seat as a member of your Committee, to take effect on Thursday, the 17th inst., at which time I propose to take my leave of the readers of the paper.

I cannot sever the ties by which I have been connected with you since I became the editor of the *Freeman*, without an expression of unfeigned and heartfelt regret. Your constant kindness and co-operation have made my residence among you so pleasant, that if it were not for the sense of duty, which impels me to yield personal considerations to the paramount claims of the cause in which we are mutually engaged, I should wish to remain permanently with you. I can only thank you individually and as a body for the many tokens of appreciation and sympathy by which you have made my labours, while in your service, at least pleasant to myself, if not useful to the cause, and express the hope that your future efforts in behalf of the slave may contribute to your own peace of mind, and serve to hasten the glad day when his fetters shall be broken.

I remain, your friend and fellow-labourer,

OLIVER JOHNSON.

Philadelphia, March 8, 1853.

After the reading of the foregoing letter, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That the resignation of Oliver Johnson, of his office of Editor of the Pennsylvania *Freeman*, and of his place as a member of this Committee, be, and hereby is, accepted.

Resolved, That in parting with our friend and fellow-labourer, we heartily reciprocate the assurance of personal regard and regret, at parting, contained in his letter; that we have a high appreciation of the ability with which he has performed his part, and of the services which he has rendered to the cause while he has been with us; and that we are reconciled to part with him only by the conviction that he is peculiarly qualified for the more important position to which he has been invited, and the belief that in his new position he will be able to exercise a wider and more beneficent influence upon the cause.

UNCLE TOMITUDES.—In Henirick's last Quarterly Leipzig Catalogue, it is stated that no less than twelve different German translation of 'Uncle Tom's Cabin' appeared in Germany during the months of October,

November and December. An English paper adds that four or five others have since appeared. What the influence of the book is on the continent of Europe may be estimated by the following statement made by a correspondent of the Newark Daily *Advertiser*, who writes from Dresden:

"A few weeks ago, at the annual fair in Dresden, one of the greatest curiosities of the day was a negro woman with a large iron ring in her nose, represented as a fugitive from Slavery. She was pictured upon the outside of the building, chained by the ring, and a driver holding a long whip in his hand, standing by. The admittance was about five cents, U. S. currency. Thousands flocked to see her, in order to gather from life an idea of American Slavery. It was a good speculation for the exhibitor, whose name I was not able to learn. I understand the above forms a travelling exhibition, making a tour of the whole of Europe.

This exhibition, pretending to represent the cruelties of American Slavery, together with extreme piety, as represented in Uncle Tom, and the superiority of intellect, as represented in Eliza and George of Uncle Tom's Cabin, and the theatre, are creating a universal feeling of hatred among the masses of Europe, against the republican government of the United States; and monarchists are taking advantage of it, through the newspapers, to add fuel to the fire, to overwhelm that spark of independence which was kindled through the whole of Europe in 1848-49."

Such lamentations from letter-writers abroad are not uncommon. One of them, in another paper, says that a knowledge of the condition of the New York streets and the reading of 'Uncle Tom's Cabin' have done more to prejudice Europeans against this country than all other things beside. We do not see that any other remedy can be applied in such a state of things than good brooms of one sort and another to sweep away both the material and the moral offences.

The 'Key' to the 'Cabin' has not yet appeared, but is looked for with a good deal of interest. A Boston letter-writer to one of the morning papers says that orders for it from the South are very large. In a letter to the editor of the Pennsylvania *Freeman*, the publishers say:

Our intention was to have published this work by the first of March; but we have been prevented from so doing by circumstances beyond our control, namely:

1. *The Sickness of Mrs. Stowe.*—The compiling of this work has been such a herculean task, that her physical powers have hardly been equal to the labour.
2. *The Size of the Work.*—It will be *ninety-four pages larger than the cheap* 'Uncle Tom,' and that number of pages larger than we had any idea that it would be. But the world will thank her for the completeness of the work. She could not have stopped short, without abridging in such a manner as would materially impair the thoroughness of the exposition.
3. *The enormous demand.*—We commenced printing *twenty thousand copies* for the first edition, but orders poured in so largely, that we were obliged to increase the edition to *forty thousand copies*, and these are neerly all ordered in advance of publication; and, from present appearances, we should not be surprised if we were compelled to increase the number to *sixty thousand* before we can commence answering *first orders.*

THE FOREIGN SLAVE TRADE.—It is no new thing to hear that the Foreign Slave Trade derives its strength partly from the supineness of the Government of the United States, partly from the participation in it of citizens of this Republic. The charge has been brought forward from various quarters again and again, and the evidence has been made public quite as often, but both have now come in a new shape and from a new quarter. On Saturday last, Mr. Seward offered a Resolution in the Senate, calling for certain diplomatic correspondence, the object of which is understood to be the publication of the dispatches received from the minister at Brazil, Mr. Schenck, relative to the African Slave Trade. This statement in regard to this subject is made by the Washington correspondent of the *Times*.

Mr. Schenck's friends say that he has sent nearly thirty dispatches to the State Department, without receiving an answer to one of them. The following is the substance of his story. In the year 1851, the African Slave-Trade with Brazil became quite extinct, chiefly through the vigilance of the British cruisers and the Brazilian Government. In the Spring of 1852, Mr. Schenck addressed an earnest dispatch to the Department, representing the evident indications of the revival of the traffic. The difficulties which were placed in the way of the importation of slaves, had doubled their value in the market. The panic among the traders had subsided, and they were evidently preparing to resume their slave-hunting voyages. Mr. Schenck added, that under the existing state of things, no flag was so likely to be prostituted to the protection of the slavers as our own; because the trafficers in human flesh knew that it gave them immunity from search on the high seas by any except our own Naval police; and we have no war-vessels, or preventive service, on the Brazilian coast, that are suitable for the purpose. Still less have we an available guard against the approach of slavers to the Brazilian coast, where they find a market.

The American squadron at Brazil consisted of the Frigate Congress and the sloop-of-war Jamestown, both too large and of too deep draft to follow the slavers fearlessly close in-shore, or to run behind the islands and into the creeks, coves and inlets, where the slavers take in their stores, land cargoes, or avoid pursuit. For a long time, during the disturbances, in La Plata, the River squadron there and the American slavers, had a perfectly free run The British squadron have small and swift steamers for this service, one of which, with a single pivot gun, is worth whole fleets of large ships and batteries of the heaviest metal. Such a vessel has been asked for repeatedly by our Ministers, but is vain. Mr. Schenck repeats the request earnestly. The slave-traders understand the powerlessness of our preventive force, and therefore sail under our flag.

Two fast sailing American vessels, the Camargo and Mary Adeline, were fitted out some time ago at Brazil and sailed for Africa. The American Minister and Consul were well satisfied of their object, but could get no proof sufficient to detain them. Had one man-of-war been present, they would have been overhauled and searched; but even then they would probably have not obtained proof sufficient to condemn the vessel under the present laws. The investigations concerning these vessels disclosed circumstances sufficiently suspecious to result in the arrest, under the Brazilian law, of Brazilian citizens, whose names in the charter indicated that they were a party, but our laws were powerless.

Mr. Schenck recommends the following remedies:

First.—Prohibition by law of all direct trade in vessels of the United States, between Brazil and the African coast. This would be a strong measure, but would not affect honest traders, as there is no direct trade between these points, not directly nor indirectly connected with the Slave Trade. Even if there were a little disadvantage to commerce, it would be insignificant, compared with the great good which would be accomplished. Horses and cattle have been imported lately from the Cape of Good Hope to Rio Janeiro, and the slave-traders, under the pretext of intending to take a cargo of brutes, provide large stores of water and other supplies for human freights. They ship a few horses, perhaps, and clear at the Cape for Brazil. After getting safely out, they tumble overboard the less valuable animals, and proceed to convenient points to procure bipeds, and then return direct to the Brazilian market. The prohibition of direct trade would prevent these evasions.

Second. If this is objected to, Mr. Schenck suggests that we might then accomplish something by prohibiting the exportation from Brazil, in American bottoms, of articles suited only or principally for the Slave-trade, such as scarlet cloths, cannon guns, gunwowder, rude musical instruments and gew-gaws.

Third. To prohibit the granting of Consular sea-letters to American vessels sold on the coast of Brazil or Africa, for any purpose except making a direct voyage homeward. This would prevent sham transfers of vessels to evade the laws and get them in the slave-trade under the American flag.

Fourth. If none of these measures should be adopted, Mr. Schenck urges an immediate re-organization of the preventive force, and makes an eloquent appeal for the vindication of the national honour, and the fulfilment of our duty to God and humanity, which should no longer be outraged. S.

"THE BLACK SWAN."—Miss Greenfield, better known as "The Black Swan," is to give a concert in this city at Metropolitan Hall, this (Thursday) evening. It is her first appearance, in public, in this city, and her last, we believe, in this country before leaving for Europe, where she goes to complete her musical education.

Miss Greenfield, we learn, was born a slave in Mississippi, and retains the name of her former master. Her mistress manumitted all her slaves, removed to Philadelphia, and became a member of the Society of Friends, but retained the child Elizabeth, in her own family, till her death. She gave her, however, no advantages of education, and the young woman has risen to her present position by the force of her own unaided talents. Her success in Europe will be unquestionably very great. She will be received as one of Uncle Tom's daughters, and will enhance the estimation there of our Republican Institutions.

There might be, under some circumstances, a question as to what reception awaits her here. Her vocal powers, we understand, are unquestionably great, and such as, were she of another race, would make her, at once, the fashion. But the fact that she is a coloured woman, of mixed African and Indian blood, might make all the difference. A doubt very likely exists whether, being a negro, she can be a singer of any uncommon power; or, if it is conceded that she can be, then whether she ought, and should be permitted to exercise her genius before white people. In either case it may be thought a flying in the face of Providence. However, that her presence shall be tolerated is, as far as can be, provided for. The public is given to understand that if they will condescend to listen to her, they shall be no farther shocked than is absolutely necessary. She, poor woman, cannot help her black skin; and if her patrons will submit to that, it is all that shall offend them. To her advertisement is appended the following:

PARTICULAR NOTICE.—No coloured persons can be admitted, as there has been no part of the house appropriated for them.

THE "BIGLOW PAPERS."—Messrs. Ticknor, Reed and Fields, of Boston, we are glad to hear, are about to publish a new edition of the "Biglow Papers" by James Russell Lowell. The first edition is entirely out of print, and the book is a good deal inquired for. These "Papers" are unrivalled in their way, and were not only popular, but exercised a very marked influence upon the public mind at the time of their appearance. A new audience, we hope, now awaits them, and that their circulation may be in accordance with their threefold merit of the purest fogyism, the purest Yankeeism, and the purest Anti-Slavery.

Domestic Correspondence.

FROM OUR BOSTON CORRESPONDENT.

NO. CXXII.

THE ARGUMENT.—*The Correspondent at a loss—But findeth himself—He compareth his satisfactions—Why he enjoyeth Mr. Phillips' drubbing—He inveigheth against Dresden China—He exalteth himself, and why—He praiseth Mr. Mann, the American and Commonwealth—And quoteth Justice Shallow—He discriminateth between Mr. Phillips and others—He indicateth the patriotism of the others—And showeth their bravery—He laudeth the Free Soilers—But giveth them no monopoly of patriotism—The Noble Army of Martyrs—The Correspondent displayeth his Learning—He rebuketh a Neologism—And citeth Tom Thumb the Great—He propoundeth two Questions—He earnestly desireth to be converted—He hopeth all things from lawyers turned Abolitionists—He defendeth Mr. Mann from unfriends—And citeth Cæsar and General Heath—Mr. Mann's commentaries and his own—He philosophizeth and moralizeth—He maketh Distinctions—He speculateth concerning the Devil, the Legislator and the Abolitionist—He is candid, monitory and parental—He expoundeth the Philosophy of Punition—And concludeth hopefully, &c. &c. &c.*

BOSTON, March 28th, 1853.

NOTHING of any particular account has happened since I wrote to you last, and I hardly know how to fill up my appointed column. The thing that has given me the most contentment, of late (always excepting the ejection of District Attorney Lunt and Marshal Devens from office), has been the drubbing Mr. Wendell Phillips has been getting at the hands of the Hon. Horace Mann. I like to see him getting his gruel, at last. He has, all along, been treated as if he were of better tempered clay than we delft vessels, and handled, even by the adversary, as if he were a Dresden tea-cup. While I, for instance (having Mr. Mann's example before my eyes, I feel emboldened to recount my own sufferings), while I have been banged and buffeted and such showers of thwacks and thumps have lighted on my unlucky head, that, as poor Sancho said, "if it were to rain mitres, ne'er a one would fit it;" all this time, I say, this Mr. Phillips has been skulking "among the waggons in the rear," out of reach of the cudgels, and enjoying my calamities with a truly Lucretian pleasure! I thank Mr. Mann for that descriptive phrase. I entirely agree with the Lowell *American* (I think it is) and the Boston *Commonwealth*, that it is a good phrase, and, as Justice Shallow saith, "good phrases are, and ever were, very commendable."

But while I have nothing to say in behalf of Mr. Phillips, but leave him to defend himself as best he may against his antagonist, I must entreat Mr. Mann not to put all Abolitionists "*refusing office or refusing to vote*" into the same category with that individual. He, we will admit, prefers ignominiously hiding himself among the waggons in the rear, or at best basely drudging with the pick-axe and spade in the trenches, from pure want of spirit; but I can assure Mr. Mann there are men among us with souls above these things, if we can only see the way clear before us. Some of us would not have the least objection to wear epaulettes and gold lace, and to ride a cock-horse,

"With our long sword, saddle, bridle,
Whack, row de row!"

on the muster-field at Washington, instead of delving obscurely with the entrenching tools among the pioneers—the sappers and miners—if he will only be good enough to show us that our scruples are slight and inconsiderable. Nay, there are those of us who would be willing to suffer under the Martyrdom of Mileage, to endure, even, the agony of Eight Dollars *per diem*, if our country called for it. Yea, and would if it were *Ten!* We would boldly encounter such a danger, saying, as the Lord Mayor of London did, when he went a-hunting and was told the *hare was coming*—"let her come, a God's name! I'm not afeard of her!"

Mr. Mann must not suppose that patriotism is entirely confined to his own party and the other two "healthy political organizations." We freely confess to the amount of that virtue which inspires the Free Soilers as well as the Whigs and Democrats. We have looked on with admiration, I hope not with envy, and witnessed the swiftness of the self-devotion with which they were ready to sacrifice themselves on altars of any size, from the big one at Washington, on which Senators and Members of the House are offered up, to the little ones in the States, devoted to the incremation of Members of Assemblies and General Courts, Aldermen of Cities and Selectmen of towns. But though we have stood aside from these *anto da fés*, while bolder confessors were courting the Stake, it was not from want of patriotic zeal, but from a Scruple (foolish, perhaps) which we are quite ready to have explained away. Let Mr. Mann but convert us from the error of our ways, and he will find that there are some Garrison Abolitionists of a different calibre from this Mr. Phillips. Men who will be ready, at the Call of their Country, to enlist in that Noble Army of Martyrs (two hundred and forty, or thereabouts, I forget the exact number) in the House of Representatives at Washington—every one of whom is there solely against his will, to the great damage of his private business and inconvenience of his family affairs, every man of whom has taken his seat, as Benedick took Beatrice, "upon great compulsion, and partly to save the lives" of his constituents. Or, missing such conspicuous immolation, who would consent to suffer an obscurer doom in the provincial Capitols. Men who, if not permitted to die in the Colosseum, would consent to suffer in the Amphitheatre at Nismes, rather than miss of the Crown of Martyrdom, altogether.

Now, though we do not complain of Mr. Mann's treatment of Mr. Phillips, we think he has not paid that attention to the rest of us which our entire willingness to be converted deserves. It seems to me that Mr. Mann has devoted too much of his Rejoinder to what Plato and other Ancient philosophers (I like to show a little learning, occasionally, as well as Mr. Webster) used to denominate the *Skiomachia*, or Shadow-fighting. That he conjures up an adversary of his own devising—that Mr. Phillips had charged him with "*moral indifferentism*" (a vile neologism, by the way, and of evil ensample from a *pedagogomastix*, or Scourger of School-masters!*) on the subject of Slavery. Like Tom Thumb the Great,

"He made the Giants first, and then he slew them!"

But he is not as clear as he thinks he is on the two questions which we long to have cleared up.

* I do not accuse Mr. Mann of coining it, observe. I know it is of English mintage, but it bears no royal image and superscription to make it current. I'll maintain with my sword that the phrase is vile.

First, "Does the Constitution of the United States require the Rendition of Fugitive Slaves, on claim of the owner?" If not, then we have the chief, if not the only, obstacle removed out of our way. But if yea, then, *Secondly*, "is not a man who swears to support the Constitution bound to take measures for the execution of this provision, by himself or his representative, in Congress or State Legislature, according as the duty of executing it may lie with the one or the other." If it be his duty to see that due provision is made for the execution of that clause—by providing of process, appointing officers, &c.—it follows, of course, that he is not to resist such process and such officers; but, contrariwise, to assist the one in executing the other, if lawfully called upon to do so. If he hath nothing to do with providing the process and officers, by himself or his representative, but is at perfect liberty to proceed in the case of a fugitive slave as if the Constitution had never existed; then the alternative difficulty is removed out of the way of the Disunion Abolitionist, and he may go to the polls, or to Congress, or the White House, with a perfectly clear conscience. We can assure Mr. Mann that we are quite ready to be convinced that we are in error on either of these two points, and shall hold ourselves greatly indebted to him or to anybody else who will put us on the road to the American paradise of Office.

So, again, I cannot but think that there are Disunion Abolitionists who in the time past of their lives (Heaven forgive them!) have been lawyers, who would be willing to perform their professional duty to men accused, like Drayton and Sayres, of assisting in the escape of Slaves, as in the case so picturesquely described by Mr. Mann, even if threatened "by men with bowie knives and pistols in their pockets," especially, after Mr. Mann's providential escape. I do not mean that Mr. Phillips would, of course; but I hope there may be men in the Garrisonian ranks ready to do as faithfully (though not so ably) what was done by Messrs. Mann and Carlisle at that tumultuous crisis, if they could be cured of the scruple which prevents their practising their profession. Some people have been disposed to gird at Mr. Mann for the justice which he does in his Rejoinder to his own merits in the aforesaid case. Now I like it. And he has worshipful precedent for it. Cæsar did the same thing, and so did Major General Heath. To be sure, they wrote in the third person. The first-named warrior would say, "Cæsar did this or that," the latter, "this being the opinion of our General, he did so and so." But if Mr. Mann prefers writing his Commentaries in the first person singular, I, for one, have no objection. On the contray, I like it. I intend to write mine in the same way.

I do not at all wonder that our Free Soil friends should be a little testy at the pertinacity of such fellows as this Phillips in bringing them up to the ring-bolt—whatever that may be. For they do not stand on equal ground. We can afford to keep our tempers in such a discussion, for we have everything to gain by it. We want them to convince us, and have a motive for keeping all our wits about us, that we may be convinced. I do not say that they are not in an equally candid frame of mind; but they are certainly not as free from disturbing influences as we are. If they come to us, they must give up all that seems to them "to make ambition virtue;" if we go to them, we shall at least have our chance in the scramble of politics. We wish Mr. Mann to make plain to us the distinction he attempts to establish between the same man as legislator and Abolitionist, so that we may feel sure that when the Devil comes to fetch the Legislator, the Abolitionist may go in the other direction. We do not say that they are not as willing to be convinced by Mr. Phillips; but it does seem to us that they are not as favourably situated for conviction. We do not doubt that Mr. Mann, and the Free Soil party, honestly believe that their Method of Political Action, inside the Constitution, is better than ours of Political Action, outside of it. But we are sure that they are wrong and we are right. And when we comment on their Speeches or their Short-comings, it is in no spirit of personal hostility, but of genuine friendship, that we do it. George Thompson once said that Garrison was the Grandfather of the Free Soilers. If so, the Abolitionists are their Fathers. The discipline we administer is purely parental. If we chasten them, it is only because we love them. If we spare not the rod, it is only that the child may not be spoiled. If the child is froward and will "beat the nurse," we are sorry; but cannot alter our course to oblige it. They will thank us for our correction, as the schoolmasters used to say, the longest day they have to live.—D. Y.

[For the Standard.]

A COLONISATION SERMON.

ABOUT the commencement of the present year, it was announced that Rev. J. B. Pinney, Secretary of the New York State Colonisation Society, was to preach on his favourite subject the next Sabbath at Union Village, Washington County, New York.

I had the privilege of listening to his discourse, and, thinking it might not be uninteresting to your readers, and with your leave, I will lay a brief outline of the sermon before them.

His text was from the 62d chapter of Isaiah. "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me," &c. The preacher told us that Christ applied these words to himself, but we must consider in what sense it would apply to him. It was evident he did not come to open literally the "Prison to them that are bound," for there was a vast number of Prisoners and Slaves among mankind at the time of his Advent, and their Prisons were not opened, nor their fetters stricken off. But Christ came to give Liberty to man gradually, as he was prepared for it, by drying up the fountains of Bondage—Sin.

But the grace of God has not yet worked effectually, to produce this result. There is no possible control of mankind by any other means than Superstition or Brute Force, unless it be through the Power of the Gospel of Christ. Look at Heathenism everywhere, in all ages. Absolutism, Terror, Bloodshed, is the only rule of action in Governments, in Societies, in families. Slavery was the one, universal, all-pervading, System, previous to the coming of Christ. Not a single passage can be found, in the whole round of ancient literature, where even a *doubt* is expressed as to the Rightfulness of Slavery. There is no Liberty but in Christianity, and not even *there* unless the people have the teachings of God's word. Witness Spain, Italy, and other countries, where the Catholic Priests withheld the Bible from the People. No nation, no community, no individual, can be safely entrusted with personal Liberty, without the teachings of the Bible. Even in England, where the people are far in advance of most other Europeans (probably because the Episcopal Clergy have not taken the right ground in regard to teaching the Bible to the People), there is a necessity for a standing Army of 30,000 to keep the people under due restraint.

Ireland is not prepared for freedom, and her people cannot safely be entrusted with it. In those countries where the people do not have the teachings of God's word, or have them only imperfectly or in part, Liberty can be allowed only in an imperfect degree. Hence Rulers more or less despotic bear sway, not because they love power, but because, if left to the full enjoyment of liberty, the people would drench the land in each other's blood.

New England was settled by the Puritans with their *Bible*, and they took *that* for their code of Laws till they got time to frame a new one. The South was settled more by the Episcopalians, and a somewhat different state of things existed among them. Our National Government was modelled very much after the New England Township system of affairs. Democracy sprang from the New England settlements. Where did they get it? From the *Bible*. Our noble system of government resulted from the blessed Book.

Other Nations, like Mexico and France, have attempted to copy our Institutions, but without that Bible teaching which lies at the foundation of our glorious structure of Civil and Religious Liberty, their experiments have failed and they have fallen back upon Monarchy, or, what is worse, Anarchy. There is no Liberty for man but in the Bible. We get it, only through the blood of the Martyrs and the Cromwells, whom God raised up to break the bands of Priestcraft and Despotism. And it was richly worth what they paid for it.

Looking at the Southern portion of our country, we find 3,000,000 of Heathen from Africa. Let us enquire what is the condition of that country from which they came. It would seem that in consequence of their wickedness, God hath given them over to darkness and corruption. For 4,000 years Africa has been sunk in the lowest depths of barbarism and steeped in cruelty and blood. Her people have not enough of enlightenment to carry on any regular system of Government. They have not the skill and concentration of effort to construct prisons for the punishment and reformation of criminals, consequently they rely chiefly on two modes of punishment—Death and Fines.

The larger offences, such as murder, adultery, and theft, are visited with Death upon the offender; for smaller crimes he is fined. As they have little in the shape of property, he is often unable to pay the fine, and therefore his wife and children first, and, if that is not enough, himself next, must be sold to pay.

In consequence of this state of things, 100,000,000 of the people of Africa are slaves. A small number of these slaves have been brought to this country, and *probably in many cases it was the means of saving them from Death, which would have been their doom in their own country.* We have heard much about the stealing of negroes in Africa; but it must be a very *stingy* man who would steal them, when he could buy enough of them at from 8 to 12 dollars a head. When an Exporter of Flour from this country wants a cargo, he has but to say to a wholesale dealer in one of our seaports, "I want so many barrels of flour." The dealer, by the power of Steam, or now by Lightning speed, sends to some inland town or mill, and the flour is forthcoming.

So the Slaver has but to go to a Slave-dealer on the coast and say, "I want so many slaves, six months hence." The dealer sends his agent into the interior, where, among this 100,000,000 of slaves, he finds little difficulty in supplying the demand.

But if it was wrong to bring these people from Africa to our Southern States, who inflicted that wrong? It was not done by the South, for they were never a commercial people. It was New York, and Boston, and Providence, and Salem, who engaged in the African Slave Trade. It was the people of the North who reaped its profits, and on them rests the responsibility of introducing Slavery into this country.

But the slaves have now passed from our hands. We can have no more control of them. The South is also responsible for the continuance and direction of Slavery. Of one thing we may be assured, that in their present condition the slaves are utterly unfit for freedom. They have not the teachings of the Bible. Let them free as they are to day, and Violence, and Bloodshed, and Anarchy, and ruin to themselves and all concerned, would be the consequence. They must first be prepared for freedom by giving them the Sabbath School and the means of Religious Instruction.

But though we can at present do little or nothing for the slave in this country, we can and should do much for Africa. Through the great and noble medium of Colonisation, we may give to these dark recesses of Barbarism the light of Civilization, Refinement and Christianity. We must repay Africa for the wrongs we have done her, by sending her that inestimable book, the Bible.

So much for the Sermon. I own I have given but a very *meagre* sketch of it, but I think it is a *candid* and *impartial* one, from which the reader may get a pretty intelligent idea of its general scope. Perhaps it may seem strange to some others, as it did to me, that we should be called on to repay Africa for the wrongs we had done her, when the speaker had just shown so clearly that we had done her no wrongs, but had merely performed an act of Benevolence, by saving the lives of some of her doomed victims, by bringing them to our Free, Happy, and Christian country. It seemed to me that any one who *listened to* and *believed* that sermon, must regard the Law which punishes the African Slave Trade as Piracy, as a monstrous and wicked enactment, which ought at once to be repealed.

Yes! the Speaker took the dark mantle of the African Slave Trade, begrimmed and besmeared with the corruption of festered and putrifying Human Bodies, and dripping with the crimson fluid from the veins of lacerated and manacled victims; he took that blood-stained mantle, and washed it in the lixivium of Priestly cant and pro-slavery sophistry, till, in the eyes of those who wished "to have it so," it looked white and spotless as an Angel's vesture. And yet how often do we hear the Colonisation scheme extolled as *the* means of suppressing the Slave Trade. These Colonisation agents seem to be perfect chameleons. They take any colour to suit the times. If there is such a thing as *swindling*—obtaining money on false pretences—I think they are guilty of it. When they go round the country "soft-soaping" the people, I hope there will be "Chiels amang them takin' notes," and that you will be so kind as to "prent them."

Yours, for Truthfulness and Humanity, R. L.
WASHINGTON CO., N. Y. March 23, 1853.

THE AMERICAN SLAVE CODE.

A WORK on the American Slave Code, by William Goodell, like Mrs. Stowe's 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' has become the subject of pro slavery and clerical abuse. The *Christian Advocate and Journal*, the principal organ of the Methodists, published in this city, at their Book Room, and edited by Doctor Thomas E. Bond, under the heading, 'Notices of Books,' has condemned this book as useless—nay, as pernicious—tending only to exasperate the communities who suffer from the evil, without *commiseration for their affliction* or proposing any means of relief. We quote the following from the article in the *Advocate*:

"We cannot approve this work. The physician who accurately describes a malignant disease and paints its ravages in most glowing colours, can lay little claim to the character of a public benefactor, unless he at least suggests a practical remedy, much less if he only reiterates that which everybody knew and acknowledged before." * * * *

* * * "In the work before us, it was sufficient for the argument to exhibit the slave codes as they stand upon the statute books of the slaveholding States. No argument or illustration can add to the intensity of the conviction they impress of the evils of Slavery, but the author *exhausts his rhetoric in declaiming against the evil—a work of supererogation, certainly; and, what is worse, tending only to exasperate the communities who suffer from the evil without commiseration for their affliction or proposing any means of relief.*"

The *Advocate's* objection to the work in question, that it suggests no remedy, is silly and irrelevant, for the following reasons: Mr. G.'s book accomplishes all he proposed; the book is only a part of the machinery which Abolitionists have put and are putting in operation; and they do not admit they have suggested no remedy for the evils of Slavery, or that there is any difficulty in devising one. The objection reminds us of the pedagogue who condemned an excellent work on geometry because it did not treat of arithmetic. We do not admit the plea of necessity which is urged. We know that neither the condition of the slaves nor the circumstances of the masters make Slavery necessary; that there is no necessity but what slaveholders themselves create.

But the work of Abolitionists is not done, even admitting every one knows and acknowledges beforehand all they have to say, and are convinced of the moral, social and political evils of Slavery. We know, however, and the *Advocate* knows, that there exists a large amount of ignorance among people here respecting Slavery in the South; that they are not yet generally convinced of the evil. We know, moreover, whether the *Advocate* knows or not, that he is not himself sufficiently convinced of the evil; otherwise, he would not have written such an article as the one now before us.

Do ministers, when they ascend the pulpit, use no argument or illustration beyond the bare assertion of the law or gospel, to add intensity to conviction? The writer was at one time favoured with the pulpit ministrations of such persons as the Rev. Editor of the *Advocate*, and well does he remember the distinctions made between convincing and convicting the sinner—between the sinner giving his assent and his consent, &c. &c. to the truths of the Gospel. Those persons did not think it merely sufficient that those to whom they preached believed themselves sinners—which, by the way, was a very general belief—and were convinced of the evil of sin. They did not consider their "rhetoric exhausted" nor think they were performing "a work of supererogation" until they so convinced and so convicted the sinner that he gave up his sins. They gave themselves little trouble about devising means and ways. They knew the sinner had the means within his power, and that where there is a will, there is a way.

This is the ground which is taken by the most ultra Abolitionists. They consider their work incomplete so long as there is such a thing as a slaveholder or a slave in existence. It is not that the evil of Slavery is known and acknowledged, but that the evil be abolished. So long as the evil exists, the Rev. Editor of the *Advocate* may rest assured that they will not consider their "rhetoric exhausted" nor their work accomplished. So far as devising means and ways for the sinner to escape from the evil and the sin, that part of the work must, of necessity, in a great measure, devolve upon the sinner himself. He says:

"The vehement denunciations of the writer against Ministers of the Gospel for not preaching openly and loudly against Slavery, his exhortations to 'cry aloud and spare not,' if he means only preachers of the Gospel in the free States, is simply absurd, as such preaching could effect nothing, being addressed to those only who are not involved in the evil; and if he means preachers in the South, it is urging them to preach rebellion—hopeless rebellion—involving the utter destruction of the coloured people, slave and free, in the slaveholding States."

Abolitionists are charged with denouncing Ministers of the Gospel. If those who prefer the charge will leave out the word "Gospel," some of them, at least, will have little hesitation in admitting the correctness of the charge. We do not, however, see what right those gentlemen have to complain, while they admit the evil and the sin, and yet remain politely dumb in view of them. But these denunciations are not made merely because they do not preach against Slavery, but because, when ever they preach at all about it, they generally preach in its favour. They understand the meaning and the force of an announcement made 1,800 years ago, "He that is not with me, is against me." They do not admit that their denunciations of pro-slavery ministers, even should they include Doctor Bond himself, would fairly subject them to the charge of denouncing Ministers of the Gospel. There was in the days of Paul, as there is in these days, such a thing as another Gospel, of which the Apostle said, "Though I or an angel from heaven preach it unto you, let him be accursed."

The Editor of the *Advocate*, however, cannot be so ignorant as to believe that by preaching against Slavery in the North, Ministers address those only who are not involved in the evil. Has he no knowledge of the existence of such a thing as a Fugitive Slave Law, which requires and makes it imperative on citizens of the free States to catch and throw back into Slavery every one who tries to escape from the Southern house of bondage? Does he not know that this law is in open violation of one of the plainest precepts of the Bible? "Thou shalt not deliver unto the master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee. He shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best: thou shalt not oppress him." He knows full well that the Fugitive Slave Law is not a State law, but a United States law. It is a peculiar characteristic of the laws of this country that they are made by the people; he knows that the law in question is the production of those whom ministers address at the North, as well as of those they address at the South. We have, moreover, to inform the Editor of the *Advocate* that if the North were not involved in the evil, it would be simply absurd to suppose that preaching against Slavery in the South would be "preaching rebellion—hopeless rebellion—involving the utter destruction of the coloured people, slave and free, at the South." If Slavery were preached against there, and the slaves made to know their rights, and should choose to free themselves by rebellion, the South alone could not retain them in boundage. They would be quite able to take care of their own liberty, so far as the South is concerned.

Notwithstanding the insinuation, that to preach Anti-Slavery is to preach rebellion, Abolitionists do not counsel any means but those which are peaceful and moral for accomplishing their work; they would not, if they could, free the slave by such means as the *Advocate* would represent Anti-Slavery preaching to be. The Gospel itself was a rebellion in this sense that it raised mobs of infuriated men, who would not listen to its truth, who thrust out of their cities and destroyed those who preached it. Sealing the mouths of ministers, both North and South, on the subject of Slavery, is a sufficient justification of all the Abolitionists have said respecting the Church and Ministry. If Doctor B. and his brethren stand in their way, and, both by example and precept, increase their difficulties, they should not complain if, in removing them, they only use hard words. "It must needs be that offences come, but wo to that man by whom the offence cometh." Who are so guilty before God, for this national sin, as those who are regarded as the accredited expounders of His law, who nevertheless have nothing to say against it. If examples are to be made, society approves the practice of making examples of those who are the greatest criminals.

But are these pro-slavery Ministers, generally, that holy, devoted, self-denying class of men they would have the world believe? Is their present position in relation to this question, one more of principle than of popularity? Is it quite clear if the same popularity and self-interest attended preaching against Slavery, which attends preaching in its favour, or being silent, that we would not oftener hear of Anti-Slavery sermons being preached from the pulpits, even in the free States? Have we no reason to believe, when the time comes, and come it will, when this nation will rise as one man to remove the foul blot from their otherwise fair fame, that those very ministers who are now silent, or who oppose us, will be loud and vociferous in its condemnation? It has been said, and justly, that the action of ministers on the Slavery question has injured their usefulness in other respects; that their ministrations are not now attended with their wonted unction. What means this crying aloud and cutting themselves, to get up what they call revivals, and why the general dearth of spirituality, so much complained of, and want of power attending their preaching? A writer, the Rev. Henry Smith, in a recent number of the *Advocate*, relates a conversation which took place between a minister and a very learned Doctor, not long since, in which modern preaching is thus described: "Their language is smooth and correct, but without power, they select a topic and spin it out so fine, and beat it so thin, that one grain of common sense would knock it into a thousand pieces." "This gentleman," says Mr. Smith, "no doubt expressed the opinion of many others, learned as well as unlearned, concerning our modern style of preaching, which at best sometimes amounts to little more than a mere aping some great sermonizer."

If the above were found in the speech of some Anti-Slavery lecturer, it would be regarded as a deadly thrust at the character of the Christian Ministry. We should never hear the end of the daring Anti-Christianity of the sentiment, the injury that ultra-Abolitionists are doing to the cause of Christianity. If it be true, and we believe it is, it justifies all the denunciations which the Abolitionists have used, and all they have said respecting ministers. Those who are merely apes of some great sermonizer, cannot lay claim to the character of ministers of the Gospel; and the sooner the influence and example of such men are removed from the church, the better. If the Anti-Slavery movement effects no other good, it will perform a good work if it accomplishes this.

Notwithstanding the condemnation of Mr. Goodell's Book by the *Christian Advocate*, which is to be regarded rather as a recommendation, we would recommend it to every person who wants information upon the subject. It was issued from the press at the right time, and can be used profitably as an accompaniment to Uncle Tom's Cabin. PHILO-AFRICAN.

☞ OLD COLONY (MASS.) ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.—A quarterly meeting of this Society will be held in CARTER, on Thursday, April 7th, commencing at 10 o'clock, A. M., and continuing through the day. We hope our friends throughout the country will so arrange matters as to be present. Let the occasion be one of interest. The meeting will be addressed by Parker Pillsbury and others.
H. H. BRIGHAM, Sec. BOURNE SPOONER, Pres.

Deaths.

TAPPAN.—In Brooklyn, March 24, Susanna, wife of Louis Tappan.

FRANCIS.—At Boston, March 20, David Francis, of the firm of Munroe and Francis, aged 73.

PIERCE.—In Cummington, Mass., March 12, Brister Pierce, coloured, exact age not known, said to be 100. He was formerly a slave in Worcester Co., and had been a pauper many years.

DUNCAN.—In Cincinnati, Ohio, March 23, Dr. Duncan, late United States Senator.

NEW BOOKS,
Of Rare Interest and Value,

JUST PUBLISHED BY
JOHN P. JEWETT & COMPANY,
BOSTON.

Owing to the unparalleled draft upon our resources, during the past year, on account of the unexampled sale of 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' a large number of most valuable manuscripts were obliged to be untouched in our safe, waiting a favourable moment to appear in print. We have availed ourselves of the earliest moment, and now offer them to the *readers of good books*. Most of them are issued. Those still in press will be published speedily.

The Silent Land;
Or, Leaves or Consolation for the Afflicted,
BY MRS. H. DWIGHT WILLIAMS.

This volume is a compilation from the best prose writers and poets of America and England, of their most beautiful pieces, for the solace of those who mourn the loss of near and dear friends. Price, $1.

The Shady Side;
Or, Life in a Country Parsonage,
BY A PASTOR'S WIFE.

This volume is designed, in a measure, as a contrast to that charming little book, 'Sunny Side,' and we doubt not that it will meet with quite as favourable a reception as that work. It is written in an admirable style, and he who commences its perusal will hardly be able to stop until he has gone through. Price, 75 cents.

Count Struensee the Skeptic and the Christian.
TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN BY MRS. WILSON.

This most interesting work contains the history of the last days of this distinguished man, and the account of his numerous interviews and conversations with his pastor, Muntor, through whose instrumentality he was led to abandon his skepticism, and embrace the religion of Jesus. Price, 62½ cents.

The Last Hours of Christ;
BY W. G. SCHAUFFLER,
Missionary at Constantinople.

A portion of this most admirably written volume of Meditations on the last hours of our Saviour upon earth was published some years since, and met with great favour from the religious public. The work has been re-written, and very much enlarged, and is again offered to the community. We would not say a word in its commendation to those who have read the volume as originally published. To those who love to go with the Redeemer of men, to meditate in the garden of Gethsemane, or upon the mount of Olives, or by the sea of Galilee, this volume will afford a vein of sacred thought. Price, $1.

Dr. Beecher's Third Volume.

We have just issued the third volume in the series of the writings of this venerable and eloquent man, as has been lately said of him by some one, 'the father of more brains than any other man in the country.' This volume contains his VIEW OF THEOLOGY, and his celebrated Trial for Heresy, before the Presbytery and Synod of Cincinnati, with a superb steel Portrait, by Andrews. Price, $1. No Clergyman's library is complete without Dr. Beecher's writings.

White Slavery in the Barbary States.
BY HON. CHARLES SUMNER, U. S. S.

Illustrated with 50 superb designs by Billings, engraved by Baker, Smith & Andrews. Price, 50 cents.

This superb volume in its typography and illustrations, and elegant in its composition, being one of the finest productions of its accomplished author, is offered to the public in this most attractive form, with the hope that thousands may peruse its glowing pages, and from them receive fresh stimulus in their efforts to elevate humanity from degradation and wrong. They will learn from it that, in years past, *White men* as well as Blacks have felt the galling yoke of Slavery.

Philosophy Of Mysterious Rappings,
Or, the Dynamic Laws and Relations of Man,
BY DR. E. C. ROGERS.

A learned and philosophical exposure of the modern belief in spiritual manifestations, showing, most conclusively, that we need not go to the spirit world to account for those things, but that they can all be explained by human agency, and upon philosophical principles. Let the believers in spiritual rappings read this able and conclusive work. Price, $1.

The Trial by Jury,
BY LYSANDER SPOONER.

We need not inform the public that any work from Mr. Spooner's pen would be one of great research and learning—his logical acuteness as a writer is too well known. This, his last, and perhaps his greatest, effort, on the Trial by Jury, is destined to create a commotion in the world. Jurymen will learn their rights and duties from it, and also learn to what an alarming extent their rights have been encroached upon. We bespeak for this able treatise a candid perusal. Price, $1 25 in cloth; $1 50 in law sheep.

German Uncle Tom,
TRANSLATED BY PROFESSOR HUTTEN.
In one volume octavo. Price, 50 cents.

The English language has been exhausted in praise of this unrivalled tale; and this translation into the German language we believe will be as popular among the large German population in this country.

Book of 1000 Anecdotes,
Humorous, Grave and Witty,
BY M. LAFAYETTE BRYN, M. D.

There are hours when men need relaxation from the sterner labours of life, both bodily and mental. In these seasons, such a volume as the above is a desirable companion, and affords that relief which the mind needs. Price, $1.

In Press, to be issued speedily,
A Key to Uncle Tom's Cabin,
BY MRS. H. B. STOWE.

A work which will most thoroughly establish the truth of every statement in 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' and a good many *not* in that work. Price, 50 cents.

Giddings' Speeches.

The Congressional speeches of this distinguished and uncompromising Anti-Slavery veteran, who is still battling nobly with the powers of darkness, complete in one volume, 12mo., with a Portrait. Price, $1.

The Writings of Judge Jay,
On the Slavery Question.

Now first collected. An invaluable volume. Price, $1. Ready in April.

Key to Uncle Tom, in German.

This work is now being translated into German, by one of our best German scholars, and will be issued soon after the publication of the English edition.

Writings of Prof. Bela B. Edwards, D. D.
BY REV. PROF. PARK, D. D.
With a Memoir, by Dr. Park.

This work, which has been unavoidably delayed, will be issued in two volumes, 12mo., about the 1st of April.

The numerous admirers of Dr. Edwards will hail with pleasure this announcement. The collected writings of such a man are an invaluable contribution to our literature, more particularly when compiled by so ripe a scholar as Dr. Park. The Memoir glows with all the fervid enthusiasm of the Editor.

Complete Encyclopædia of Music,
BY JOHN W. MOORE,
Assisted by John S. Dwight, Esq., the learned and accomplished Editor of 'The Journal of Music.'

This work will occupy an unoccupied field, no such work ever having been compiled before, either in this country or in England. It will be a complete Dictionary of all Musical Terms, a History of the Science of Music, from the earliest times to the present; a Treatise on Harmony and Thorough Bass; a Description of all known Musical Instruments, and a complete Musical Biography, containing a succinct memoir of more than 3,000 of the most distinguished musical celebrities and composers, in one large royal 8vo. volume, of about 1,000 pages, double columns. To be issued during the summer.

The above valuable works are published by
JOHN P. JEWETT & CO., Boston.
JEWETT, PROCTOR & WORTHINGTON, Cleveland, Ohio.
And for sale by Booksellers generally.
BOSTON, March, 1853. 2m

Female Medical College of Pennsylvania.
FOURTH ANNUAL SESSION.

THE next session of this Institution will commence on September 1st, 1853, and continue *five months*, closing on the 31st of January, 1854.

Persons wishing copies of the announcement or desirous of obtaining further information, will please apply personally, or by letter to the Dean of the Faculty.
DAVID J. JOHNSON, M. D., 229 Arch st. Philadelphia.
March 3d—tt

Writings of W. L. Garrison.

SELECTIONS from the "Writings and Speeches of William Lloyd Garrison"—316 pages, duodecimo. Price—In cloth, $1; extra gilt, $1.25.
For sale at the Anti-Slavery Office, 142 Nassau st., N. Y.

The Liberty Bell for 1853.

FOR SALE AT THIS OFFICE. Price: gilt, $1,25; plain, 75 cents.

Miscellaneous Department.

NAN'S LOT IN LIFE.

A TALE.—BY HARRIET MARTINEAU.

NAN was a workhouse girl—born in a workhouse, and reared there. Nobody could tell her what her other name was; for nobody knew. Her mother was brought to the workhouse gate an hour before Nan's birth; and the tinker with whom she had travelled trudged on, saying he would come back when she should be sufficiently recovered to travel with him again. He did return; but, hearing that the poor creature had died, the same day that he left her, and thinking, no doubt, that the child would be a great inconvenience to him, he vanished, and was never seen there again. He had not said what his name was; and the poor woman was too ill to be asked any questions; and thus it was that the child had no other name than NAN—which was given her in baptism, because everybody must have a name; and this was the first that occurred. She grew up at the time when parishes were in the habit of shifting their paupers from one to another by bribing the men of one settlement to marry the women of another; and when she was eighteen, she found herself married to a country lout who was as ignorant as herself (which is saying everything), and not much inclined to hedge and ditch for five shillings a week, when he could live more comfortably in a workhouse. As their family came on, they became burdensome. Times were bad for the farmers; and it was thought as well to try the experiment of shipping off families to the colonies, where they could maintain themselves. BILL and NAN grumbled: they did not want to move: they did not know what a colony was: they did not know what the sea was. But they were obliged to go.

In a very short time a change came over them. Ignorant as they were, they were human. They had found that out when they were married; and yet more, when their first child was born. They found what it was to love; and love, with them as with a superior order of people, opened their minds wonderfully. So, when they travelled to London by the stage-wagon (there were no railroads in those days), they saw more things than they would have noticed in their youth. They stared at the towns; and, as they walked up the hills behind the slow wagon, they gathered flowers out of the hedges for the children; and, when they were taken through London, they agreed that they had never seen such a place before. By the time they got to sea, they were wide awake; and when their seasickness was over, they became quite merry. They played with the children: they helped little BILL to climb: they made a rag doll for MEG out of an old cotton handkerchief: they looked for great leaping fishes, when they had once seen a fish leap; and even learned the names of a porpoise and a black fish: and they talked for an hour together about how there could be so many little brown birds in a place so watery, where there were no hedges for miles and miles for the creatures to roost in. They had a good many companions on board, going on the same errand—some wiser than themselves, and some very silly, and even brutish. From the wiser they heard a little about the country they were going to, and found it was really true that, if they chose to work hard, they might in time have a cottage and a bit of land of their own. This new hope brightened their minds again; and the brutish behaviour of the worst of their companions bound their hearts together more than before; so that the voyage was quite an education to them; and they would have landed in the colony very different people from what they were when they left their parish, if they had ever landed in the colony at all. But they never did.

One night, when they had all got to sleep, in spite of the heat, they were awakened by a great shock and crash. The ship had struck upon a coral reef. The water came in so that the captain said they could not go on. Moreover, others said, though he did not, that most likely everybody would go to the bottom; that it was doubtful whether the ship would hold together till daylight. It just did that, and no more. When the blazing sun came up out of the sea, there was not much of the vessel above water, and only a few of the passengers were to be seen. BILL and NAN and their three children were there—looking sometimes at each other, and sometimes at the land, which was so near that they thought it would be the hardest thing that ever was if they could not get to it. The captain was drowned, the mate said, and they must shift for themselves, the best way they could. While they were staring at the land (a curious land, with wonderfully tall grass, and trees with the oddest boughs, like green fans), they saw something moving among the woods on the ridge; and in another minute, a great number of people came running down the hill.

"*Are* they people?" asked NAN. "Yes—no—yes; but their clothes fit them so tight!"

"And they have all got black faces!" exclaimed BILL. "Why—that they have! and, as I live, they have got no clothes at all—only just a little about their waists. Well! I never see such a sight!"

The mate said they were dark-skinned savages; and he wished they might be safe to deal with; but he doubted it.

It was necessary, however, to put this to the proof. The ship broke up, and before the planks all floated away, the family must save themselves, if at all. BILL was cleverer about this sort of thing than about some others; for certain night-poachings in a river at home had familiarized him with being up to the armpits in rushing water, and now and then popping over head. He now used his strong limbs to the best advantage, and placed his family safely on the beach. The dark-skinned people came about them, stared, stroked their skins, laughed, and seemed highly amused. They did not kill, nor even hurt, anybody; but they were, NAN declared, the most uncivil folks she had ever seen. There was one person, a woman, who had some gay feathers in her hair, who was quieter than the rest. Everybody made way for her; and NAN found afterwards that this was the Queen of the island.

These people killed nobody; but NAN often said in her heart that she almost wished they had. Some fish was brought; and she was compelled to lay her infant on the ground, and make a fire on the beach, and cook, not only for her own family, but for as many of the savages as were hungry, from morning till night. More and more came—some pouring over the hills, some in boats from distant islands. More than once she dropped from fatigue. If they permitted her husband to lift her up, they allowed him little time to comfort her: he was to bring the wood for the fire; and they would not let him be idle. It was a weary and dreary day; but the morrow was worse. Early in the morning, when NAN was at last asleep on the sands, she was aroused by a cry from her husband. She knew it was his voice, before she was well awake. Half a dozen of the dark men were forcing him away, and into a boat. There were plenty more to hold her back when she would have sprung after him. The boat was rowed away; and she never saw BILL again.

The people evidently meant not to be cruel. They showed by signs that she should have plenty to eat and drink: they gave her gay feathers to put in her hair: they played with the children: and they showed her that she was to have a husband, though BILL was gone. She resisted, as long as she could; but, to keep her children with her, she was compelled to yield. As soon as she got to understand their language at all, she found that they considered her to be in a position of peculiar favour. She was in the service of the Queen herself; and the Queen's Slave was secure from being treated with any unusual violence. When her new husband could make himself understood, he asked her what she would have. He would not allow anybody to knock out her brains: she had food enough to eat; she might sing if she chose; and he liked to see her with a string of shells around her neck. What would she have more? She would like a little time, to sit on the rocks, and look for a sail at sea. No; that would not be good for her. If she saw a sail, it would be of no use to her: and, even if she could go away, it would be the worst possible thing for her; for this island was the best country in the world; and it was foolish for any one who could live there to wish to be anywhere else; very silly and ungrateful. She must go and bring some wood, and boil some fish, and think no more of watching for a sail. One of her bitterest thoughts was about whether BILL had been compelled to take a black wife. If he had, she feared he might forget her in time, though she felt sure she should never forget him. Her new husband, through jealousy, divined her thoughts. But for his jealousy, he could never, he told her, have conceived so horrid an idea. If any woman of the dark race had the slightest reason to suppose that BILL ever dreamed of such a thing, she would have him burned alive. Why—the devil was of her pale complexion: and did she suppose any woman with a dark skin would marry with a white man? And the man and all to whom he whispered it, were so shocked as to be speechless. Poor NAN had a double burden of work after that hour. Worse still—little BILL, who caught up the new language with a child's quickness, let out that he knew that the devil was black. He paid dearly for his opinion. He was too dangerous to be left by his mother's side: and he was carried off to another island. Little MEG was early put in training to be one of the twenty-five wives to whom the Queen's son had a customary right. NAN could not, for a long while, comprehend this, seeing how shocking had been her notion that her husband might marry again: and she never did get to understand it. She was told she was stupid; she was asked whether she herself was not the wife of a man of the superior race. She never understood the mystery. And it was not the only puzzle that distracted her poor brain.

One day in the year was appointed for a great festival. On that day the natives celebrated their deliverance from the denomination of a tribe whom they had driven from the island. When all the cooking was done, and when the drum was heard afar off, and the laughter of the people dancing, the Queen, with one or two attendants, walked away along the beach, looking at the moonbeams on the rippling water. She came upon NAN, who was sitting with her two children under a palm tree—the mother weeping bitterly—one child asleep, the other wondering.

The Queen inquired into her regrets, and found that, in her country, it was so different from what it was here! There, one's life was safe; and she could never feel sure of her children's lives here. There, people belonged to themselves, and could make themselves happy, or try to do so, in their own way.

"So it is here," replied the Queen. "If you understood our language better, you would know that that is what we have been rejoicing about to-day. Everybody now has—what everybody ought to have—security as to life—and liberty—and to be happy."

"And I," cried NAN, starting up, "I and my children . . . . ?"

"You and your children are out of the question, of course," replied the Queen. "Look at your skins—how disgustingly pale they are! They *are* darker, however, than when you arrived, and that shows how good it is for you to be here. But you know, you are of an inferior race; and I have undertaken to arrange your happiness for you. You may be as happy here as your nature allows, if you only think so. Why do you sigh? You like your own ways better than my arrangements! That shows how you need my care. But—it now occurs to me—were you a princess in your own country? You were not? Then, there is *no* excuse for these tears. Your Fetish made your skin pale. Mine allowed me the privilege of a dark one. I must know what is good for you, therefore, better than you can yourself: and, after explaining the case to you, I shall have you punished if I see you again sullen. For this time, I forgive you."

"Mother," said MEG, when the Queen was out of hearing, "what is there so bad in our skins being pale?"

"The people here don't like them. They treat us as if we were cattle on that account."

"But why?—'cause I like ours best."

"To be sure; so do I. But these people know no better, because they are savages."

"O dear!" sighed MEG. "I wonder what we ever are to do."

"Indeed I don't know, my child; unless it is to keep remembering home, all we can, and pray God to take us out of our bondage, one day or other."

If NAN still lives, she is no doubt striving after this. If she has died, there can be no doubt that, in her gladness to get away any how, this was her last thought. As for her children, they have probably sunk to be the inferior race that they are constantly desired to consider themselves.

July 4th, 1852. —*Liberty Bell, for* 1853.

MODERN TYRANNICIDE.

PREACHMENTS are made in this quiet country about the crime of attempting to assassinate the Emperor of Austria, and we are told that the tyrannicides of classic times have ceased to excite our admiration. If so the mawkish degeneracy of the times has advanced further than we supposed, and its silliness. But these censors seem to forget some of the elements in the estimate of a man's actions, and they thus render themselves liable to a charge of confounding good and bad.

We are, it seems licensed to respect Cæsar, or even Nero; but not Brutus. Catiline would be a hero in history if he had succeeded, whom Lord Malmesbury would eulogize for his "immense glory;" and Lord John Russell would say that in doing so Lord Malmesbury had "supported well the dignity of his country." For such is really the fact. Napoleon the Third, and Francis Joseph, are the objects of official eulogy or respect; while the poor wretch who has attempted to avenge the wrongs of Hungary, is hunted down to the portal of the tomb with execration. But where is the practical sense of the distinction?

Is it that Lebeny attempted to take a man's life? If he did, the act is not of the worst. All the imperial potentates whom we have named have taken lives by wholesale; and that which is bad in a single instance cannot become good when multiplied. No man has shown a greater contempt of human life than Francis Joseph, whose executioners are continually at work with process of law, genuine or sham, or without any process of law whatever.

Is it that he approached his victim by a treacherous stealth? Even here he is not guilty as that Emperor is, or any other of the European Emperors. Do not accept our arguments, but look at the fact for yourself, and say if Lebeny is so guilty as Francis Joseph, or as Louis Napoleon, in the matter of treachery and stealth? Francis Joseph habitually employs hosts of spies, who steal around his subjects night and day, betraying them, if not inveigling them, into destruction of every shape. Louis Napoleon organized a host of assassins, primed them with wine, and set them to assassinate the people of his capital at midnight. That was literally assassination. Among the men who fell in that detestable attempt how many had been guilty of the tyrannies and cruelties that have made Francis Joseph the object of hatred to the many peoples over whom royal accomplices maintain him by their alliance? *Not one*; but if those men might have been dared even to a fair fight, what was the plea for assassinating women and girls? Lebeny is not accused of acts like those, any more than with the ingenious stranglings of Mantua.

But it is nonsense to make the stealthy approach a matter of accusation. There is, in fact, no surprise in such cases, except that which is made by the tyrant himself. Francis Joseph's whole conduct is a defiance to the tyrannicide. He casts away moral obligation; for he has broken his word with Hungary—the word of an Emperor with a people; he has set his spies in Italy to break up family ties, by punishing the son, or the wife, for not denouncing to the police a father, or a husband, guilty only of acts which are made crime by Austrian tyranny; he cannot even pay his bonds in the money market. He has cast away the respect for human life, and lavishes it to support the very caprices of his tyranny; for if Francis Joseph would consent to govern constitutionally, that is by law instead of bayonet, we all know that he might be, not tolerated, but adored. Yet he imprisons, beats, shoots, hangs, and tortures his subjects. While he thus treats them, he hedges himself round by great armies, and within them by body guards. And then he has troops of spies and scouts to warn him of danger. He casts away moral obligation; he outrages the common feelings of humanity; he surrounds himself by armies and body-guards; he keeps watch against the avenger. Is such a man "taken by surprise" when the avenger comes? No; he is taken at his word, on his own terms.

Is it that Francis Joseph abides by a law, however harsh, while Lebeny breaks it? Assuredly not. No man living, save Louis Napoleon, has broken the law in a way so wholesale as Francis Joseph. He refuses law to Italy, save his own law; and if one man may decree his code, why not another: if Francis Joseph may decree a code to warrant the slaughter of Italians by the mass, why may not Lebeny decree his own code to warrant the slaughter of one man? But it needs no refinement to establish Francis Joseph's criminality: he has broken the entire law of Hungary. A thief breaks one statue, a murderer another, a swindler a third, a ravisher a fourth, and some criminals of a deep die break several at once: Francis Joseph broke them all. He reduced Hungary to anarchy, and then for Hungarian law substituted an alien law of "siege." By defying all law, he made himself, towards Hungary, an outlaw; and the hand that brings him to justice breaks not, but executes the law. There is, indeed, one kind of action that too often unfavourably distinguishes the modern from the ancient tyrranicide, though we have no evidence that it existed in the case of Lebeny. It is quite clear that the tyrannicide who prepares for his own escape, makes from his public service two serious detractions, which go far to neutralize it altogether. He takes from it that element of sacrifice which attests the singleness and nobleness of motive; and he risks failure. Moreover, he thus renders the path more difficult to his successor. For successors there will be, so long as tyranny exists, and so long as human instincts have a deeper truth than human reasoning. If the tyrant chooses that the knife of the tyrannicide shall be the sole form of responsibility available, the choice is his own. The life of Francis Joseph, the system he impersonates, the principle he embodies, the tyranny he represents, is a summons to the tyrannicide.—*The* (*London*) *Leader*.

DEAR EDITOR: There are two or three errors, typographic, in the last year's "Matin," printed in the *Standard*, of March 10th, of such destructive force as, if this finds a place of welcome, the writer begs leave to take the present occasion to correct.

In the fourth verse, *half* is in two instances printed *help*; in the fifth, strifes represents *stripes* (which is, perhaps, an improvement); and in the sixth, booming thunders in the place of a quiet *looming*. Should the lines find a place in the recollection of any reader, these corrections of some of the inevitable results of the writer's bad manuscript may better prepare to correct or overlook any that may occur in this little Vesper.

A BIRTH-DAY VESPER.

ANOTHER birth-day come to leave me
Lingering—suffering; doth it grieve me
That the opening gates deceive me?

Since my last, Death's winning finger
Pointed toward a sky-rapt singer—
Ah, in vain! still here I linger.

Still I chant in broken lyric,
As my wishes were empiric,
And my dirges half satiric.

But more earnest ne'er was longing
For that Valley ever thronging
With the hosts to Heaven belonging.

Ah! my school-days are not ended,
Not enough the soul-arch bended—
Not enough the helpless friended.

While survives a year-full mother—
While there cries a captive brother
In a wail ear may not smother—

Here my strong heart hath its mission—
Feeble though the spirit-vision—
And my weak hand its commission.

So, content, I meekly linger,
While Pain presses with sharp finger,
And Heaven woos the earth chained singer.

Thus the birth-days come and leave me
Waiting—yet oh should it grieve me
That the swinging gates deceive me?

February 23, 1853. A. P. C.

JOE SMITH, THE MORMON PROPHET.

THE lecture of Hon. Josiah Quincy, Jr., before several of the Lyceums in this State, has directed attention anew to all that concerns the history of this extraordinary man. Mr. Quincy, however, did not state—and perhaps many of our readers are not aware of the fact—that Joe was of Topsfield [Mass.] origin. Nehemiah Cleaveland, Esq., in his very interesting and instructive address, delivered at the celebration in 1850, of the two hundredth anniversary of the incorporation of Topsfield establishes the position that the Essex county Smiths may very safely claim the paternity of the Mormon prophet. The following passage, from the appendix to Mr. Cleveland's published address, will be read with interest at this time:

Smith—that multitudinous name—occurs in the first enumeration of Topsfield Commoners. During the second part of the last century, it was illustrated by an individual of some note. Samuel Smith, Esquire, was a Justice of the Peace, and often held the place of town magistrate or agent. But the Smiths gradually died out, or departed, and this universal name is no longer of Topsfield. Among the latest lingerers was one Asahel Smith, who removed about 1793 to Tunbridge, in Vermont. This man, like "Ammon's great son, had one shoulder too high;" and thence usually bore the significant and complimentary designation of "Crooknecked Smith." He was so free in his opinions on religious subjects that some regarded his sentiments as more distorted than his neck. When he went to Vermont, a son, Joseph, then eight or ten years old, accompanied him.

In process of time, Joseph was married, and had children, among whom was one bearing his own name, and destined to make no small noise in the world. When Joseph Smith, allured by the star of Western emigration, left Tunbridge with his family, he little suspected that he had a young Mohammed in that ominous wagon which conveyed him and his household. The wagon stopped at Potsdam, in St. Lawrence county, N. Y., then a new settlement. Here, upon the banks of the noisy river Racket, whose spirit seemed to have entered into his soul, grew up the celebrated founder of the Mormon faith.

I shall not pursue the story of Joe Smith. Famous or infamous, he was no common man. His name is inseparably connected with the origin and history of a numerous and remarkable sect. When biography shall hereafter seek to trace him to his source, among the thousand genealogical lines of Smithdom, it may save her some trouble to be told that Joe's ancestors were Topsfield people; that his father was born there; and that some of the Goulds and the Balches of this old town still claim kindred with the "Prophet."

The rise of Mormonism is one of the wonders of our day. What but strong enthusiasm, impelling from within, and a fiery persecution, pressing from without could have driven a people, numbering many thousands, to seek a safe-home in the far-distant and almost impenetrable wilderness! When we were told that they had pitched their pilgrim-tents upon the remote borders of the Great Salt Lake, how little did we dream that they had gone thither to build—unwittingly indeed—a half way house, a grand caravansery, for the refreshment of a hundred thousand of our countrymen, soon to be on their way to the Pacific shore! Who will deny that there were an oversight and a wisdom here, far beyond the reach of mortal ken? Let us not despair, even of the Mormons. Left as they are to themselves, may we not reasonably expect that the developed absurdity of a wild fanaticism will prove its own corrective? May we not confidently hope that the strong native sense of the Anglo-American will at length prevail, and bring back to the faith and practice of a pure Christianity these victims of desolation?—*Salem Register*.

THE *Evening Post* publishes the following pleasant letter from Fisher Ames, taken from his works edited, and about to be published by his son:

FISHER AMES TO CHRISTOPHER GORE.

DEDHAM, Nov. 7th, 1852.

My dear friend: The very hour and minute that I received and was reading your letter about Mr. Salisbury's experiments on my orchard grass seed, pronouncing it, on philosophical authority, to be coarse and unfit for pasture; my cows were in my house-lot eating it with the voracious appetite of ignorance. The Encyclopædia, I find, says it is liked by sheep and and horses, but is *refused* by cows.

The poor things did not know that it was the "Datcylis glomeratus," and was refused by cows. It is a shame to the very cattle to be so ignorant. It was natural to expect dreadful consequences from this apparently fatal mistake.

The arts and sciences, who had spoken so plainly in the Encyclopædia, one would think, would send a witch to give my cows the cholic.

There was no temptation, and very little excuse, for the blunder, for in the lot were other grasses in abundance. The honey-suckle, or white clover, the May and spear grass, and the other various sorts, or *gramina*, as we, the learned, choose to term them. Yes, rejecting what was good and lawful, and preferring that which, it turns out, though I must insist they did not know it, was prohibited, they did prefer the aforesaid "Dactylis glomeratus," against the dignity of the Royal Society and their botanical garden, and in contempt of the common law and of the Encyclopædia as before reiterated, and in very evil example to sundry other cows, who looked over my fence, desiring to offend in like manner. I will not wholly vindicate this enormity—it is too bad for that—but I urge in palliation, that probably the "Dactylis glomeratus" is as sweet as any grass that grows so rank, probably somewhat sweeter, for the *hay* is preferred by my cattle. But I can scarcely doubt that the white clover, and other small grasses, are better pasture. But, as the orchard grass grows very fast, while others stand still, and often forms a tuft or hassock, in rich land, as large as a peck measure, unless the cattle love it *much better*, they will not keep it down so close. For, in an equal space of time, it will be ranker than other grasses, and being the rankest will, of course, be left. Yet, this very inconsiderable difference, supposing it to exist in favour of other grasses, which is, however, mere hypothesis, is an affair of trivial account. As the orchard grass is succulent and cattle *will eat it*, their preference or taste is of no great importance to your own cows; if indeed you invite your neighbour's cows to push down your fence and breakfast in your lot, you should entertain them on the best.

The grass and hay are highly nourishing, they are abundant, and with manure, bring better crops on dry lands than any other grass, perhaps not excepting clover.

The last spring I remarked my orchard grass grew thick and formed hassocks, while the dry cold weather kept all other sorts back.

On the whole, this species of grass is, with me, beyond the grade of experiment—it has tried excellence and I will stick to it.

I have a great deal more to say to you. I am full of zeal about farming; cattle and fruit trees are my themes, in prose. Poetry, if I had any, I would devote to my pig-sty and politics—two scurvy subjects, that should be coupled together. I wish exceedingly to get such cows as, being well-fed on the "Dactylis glomeratus," will give more milk than any other cows.

The Alderney breed is said to be of that description, but, being English, I make no doubt they would refuse the "Dactylis. Expect to hear from me again very soon. Your affectionate friend,

FISHER AMES.

PERSECUTIONS OF EARLY FRIENDS.

IN 1703, the New England colonies being at war with the French and Indians, John Smith was notified, on the 15th of 6th month, to take arms, and join the company of soldiers under the command of Captain Benjamin Church. As he refused complying, he was, in the First month, 1704, fined £5, beside 23*s*. charges. Feeling most peace in refusing to pay the fine, he was imprisoned; and, still continuing faithful to his religious scruples, he was, by the general sessions, put up for sale by public proclamation, to any one who would buy him for a term not exceeding four years. No purchaser appeared, and the magistrates determined to remove him to Boston Castle, there to work until his fine should be satisfied. He says that, whilst lying in prison at Dartmouth, he was often made sensible of the Divine kindness. In a little time Captain Church came to take him from his place of confinement, to send him to Boston. This officer, when inquired of for it, produced no warrant or order for the removal of the prisoner, and as John was not willing to give any aid in removing himself without it, he was taken by force.

As he was conveyed through the town, two Friends met them, who, in a quiet, pleasant manner, asked the person who had John in charge—"What art thou going to do with our Friend?" He answered—"I am going to take him to Boston Castle." The Friends then said—"Some persons, in similar cases, have been disappointed in their expectation, and their vessels have been in danger of being lost." Not deterred by this warning, he carried his prisoner on board a vessel in which was little ballast: which was thrown on its side whilst at sea by a flaw of wind, to the great danger of the lives of all. John was on deck when the incident occurred, and being active and cool-headed, he sprung, and, throwing loose the sails, occasioned the vessel to right before any of the hands could come to his assistance. This made him a favourite with those on board, and he was thankful for the great deliverance. So affected was the captain of the vessel with this providential warning and narrow escape, that when he reached Boston, neither plea nor argument could induce him to take John as a prisoner to the castle.

He was accordingly left in Boston; and, probably to save the colony expense, he was kept there as a nominal prisoner for a time, he reporting himself every day at a certain hour to Captain Church, at an inn. It would seem that they wished to give him an opportunity of running away, that they might either be safely discharged of him, or might, if he was arrested, have a better excuse for punishing him. The testimony of truth was, however, more precious to John than outward liberty; and he reported himself punctually, until they found a way of sending him to the castle. He was a prisoner four months, during which time one of his kinsmen, who was not a Friend, came to see him in disguise. The man was one of considerable note in the colony. The honest firmness and Christian integrity of the young man took hold of his best feelings. Before leaving, he said to him, "Cousin, since you have begun, I would have you hold to your principles. I have nothing to discourage you; but believe if you are faithful, the Lord will prosper you in your undertaking." He spoke this with much love and affection, and, as they parted, desired the Lord might bless him. The animated prisoner says, "Which kind visit from one who did not profess the Truth, was comfortable and strengthening to me in this my suffering state."

At last, on application by his mother to the governor [Dudley], he was set at liberty, and returned to his father's family in peace. At this time in New England, owing in part to the war with the Indians, the old hating, persecuting spirit revived in many against the Quakers. The white inhabitants were being shot down on every hand, and great waste of property was made by the natives. Yet, during all these trials, no record can be discovered of one Friend having fallen who was faithful to the principles he professed. The arm of the Lord was round about to protect them, even such as lived in very exposed situations. Mary Doe has left an interesting account for her children of her exercises and deliverances during these difficulties, in which she sets forth how the Lord strengthened her to be faithful, when her husband called her assurance of being in her place in remaining at their own dwelling, a delusion of the devil. In condescension to her husband, she made one remove; but could feel no peace nor comfort until she had returned to her own dwelling. She desired her husband not to ask her to remove again, for that she durst not do it. He still called it a notion, until Thomas Story, travelling that way, after hearing her past and present feelings, told him he did not see that Mary could have a greater revelation.

Mary thus concludes her account: "He satisfied my husband so well, that he never again asked me to go, but was very well contented to stay during all the wars, and then things were made easy; and we saw the wonderful works, and the mighty power of the Lord, in keeping and preserving us when the Indians were at our doors and windows, and at other times. And the Lord put courage in you, my dear children; do not you forget it; and do not think that you were young, and because you knew little, so you feared nothing, but often consider how you stayed at home alone, when we went to meetings, and how the Lord preserved you, and kept you, so, that no hurt came upon you. I leave this charge upon you, live in the fear of the Lord, and see that you set him always before your eyes, lest you sin against him. If I had not feared the Lord, and felt the comforts of his Holy Spirit, I could never have stood so great a trial, when so many judged and said that I was deluded, and that the blood of my husband and children would be required at my hands; but the Lord was near to me, and gave me strength and courage, and faith to trust in him; for I know his name to be a strong tower, yea, and stronger than any in the world, for I have oftentimes fled there for safety. O! blessing and honour, and everlasting high praises, be given to the Lord, and to his dear Son, our Saviour and Mediator, Christ Jesus. Amen. MARY DOE."

Two men Friends, who had often been watched by the Indians when they went to their work unarmed, and had never been molested, becoming weak in faith, took guns for protection, and were shot. One woman member, the mother of the above Mary Doe, who had, from a similar want of confidence in the protection of Providence, removed to a garrison near, was shortly after shot. We shall yet have occasion to show, in another region, how the Lord hath been pleased, for his name's sake, to save those who, in truth and sincerity, do indeed keep his commandments.

In the spring of 1705, John Smith took passage in a brigantine, Matthew Eastow, commander, bound for London. They had a stormy passage, and at divers times expected to be cast away; but the Lord, most merciful, was their preserver. They were eight weeks to Kinsale harbour, from thence, after tarrying eight days, they sailed for London. On the 13th of Fourth month, being near Plymouth, a press-gang from a man-of-war took John and two of the crew, but the captain of the ship let them return again to their own vessel. The next day, John and Thomas Anthony, who had been his companion from New England, were put on board a vessel sailing on a cruize. The Friends let the captain and officers know that they could neither fight, nor take any part in military matters. The captain treated them moderately, but gave no indication of setting them at liberty. The lieutenant was angry and threatening, saying, with an oath, many times, that he would run them through with his sword. The day after the ship left Plymouth, they overtook a French vessel. As the engagement drew near, John and his companion were taken to different guns, and commanded to do the part of warriors. This they said they could not do; for that their Lord and his apostles had commanded differently. At this they were hauled about the deck to make them work, but they patiently bore their trials, and endeavoured to prepare for greater sufferings. The French ship was taken.

These two Friends felt it necessary to be constantly on their watch inwardly and outwardly; and many fervent petitions were raised in them to the Lord, that he would be pleased to support them under whatever he might permit to befall them.

On the 18th of the month John Smith felt a concern to go upon deck. He did so, and was peaceful whilst there, yet let in reasonings as though he was not in his place, and so returned below. Here he soon became uneasy, and felt a requisition of duty to go up again. He was then again easy, but soon got to reasoning against being there, and went down a second time. Now feeling sorrowful, it was said in his heart, "Thou knowest where to get relief." At this he immediately went upon deck. After a time the lieutenant, who was walking the quarter-deck, said to the boatswain, who was on the main deck, "Have you made the Quaker work yet?" He answered, "No." "Why?" "For want of your order." The lieutenant threw him his cane, and said, "There is my order." The boatswain took the cane and began to beat John so fiercely about the head, as soon to beat the hat to pieces. The lieutenant now ordered the poor sufferer to be placed at the geers, and the cat and nine tails brought out. John was taken to the geers and made to kneel down to receive the punishment. He was freely given up to suffer, and felt the spirit of supplication, moving him to pray for those who were persecuting him, thoroughly persuaded that they knew not what they did. His life was not dear to him at that time, for the wicked conversation of those about him was burdensome to him, and he felt a willingness to die if the testimony of Truth should require such a sacrifice. Whether his prayer was vocal or not, he does not inform us, but the persecuting lieutenant changed his mind, and the flogging was not given.

The captain soon sent for him and his companion, and, on observing his hat, demanded how it came to be so torn. He meekly answered, it was done at the boatswain's pleasure. The captain of another man-of-war was present, who, with an oath, declared he would kill them as soon as he would kill a Frenchman. No further punishment was bestowed upon him at that time, but the boatswain's mate, a rough, wicked man, taking John by the shoulders, asked him why he did not stay between decks, adding, "You have been beaten enough to kill an ox." John's meek, unresisting courage had evidently made a favourable impression on this man. John says, "The sweet peace and satisfaction of mind I enjoyed in this time of my suffering, is scarcely to be expressed in words."

The vessel they were in sailed several times to Brest on the French coast, in company with a large portion of the English fleet, the officers of which wished to tempt the French to come out with their fleet to battle, but did not succeed. Once whilst at Torbay, John asked the captain to set them at liberty. This he promised to do, if they would work. The prisoners were not easy to comply; they felt it would be wrong, and deemed the captain meant to ensnare them. John says, "Through the Lord's mercy and goodness to us, we were preserved from their snares, and found his pure peace and presence to be with us in a large manner. In the greatest of our sufferings and trials. He was near, and in His comfortable presence we did rejoice that we were counted worthy to suffer for Truth's testimony." At one time he adds, "They sent for me to make points for reefing the sails, which I refusing to do, some mocked and scoffed, while others, filled with envy and malice, could scarce keep their hands from me; and thus we passed through many deep exercises, looking every day when we should receive stripes, and sometimes could see nothing but death before us. But the Lord wrought deliverance for us in His own way and time beyond our expectation, and hath been near for our preservation; blessed be His great name therefore."

On the 27th of Fifth month, they arrived at Plymouth harbour, and the captain calling them to him, said they might go on shore and refresh themselves with their Friends. It was meeting day, and they went directly to meeting, although they were in a poor dirty condition, having been in the ship six weeks with no change of clothing. They were received by Friends gladly and kindly, and we may well believe that they felt grateful emotions to the Lord their preserver, as they sat in the assembly of those gathered to worship. Everything necessary was provided for them, word having been sent to Plymouth to this effect by the owner of the vessel from which they were impressed, and by a Friend on behalf of the morning meeting at London. The captain of the man-of-war said, that as they were not men for his purpose, he gave them leave to go on shore, saying nothing of coming on board again, but he could not answer discharging them.

When well refreshed, and provided for, they travelled up to London, where they lodged with that honest old seaman, Thomas Lurting. After attending meetings in that city diligently for four weeks, John Smith took passage in a vessel bound for Philadelphia, which cleared from port about the 9th of Seventh month. Divers Friends came with them in the vessel, amongst others John Salkeld and wife, who were removing to reside in America.

After his return, John Smith soon married, and settled near Chester, Pennsylvania. From thence he removed into East Marlborough in the year 1713, where he resided more than forty years. Some years before his close he removed to New Garden, the meeting at which place he carefully attended when blessed with ability.

His Friends say of him that he was zealous for good order, and serviceable in the discipline of the church. He often spoke of the degeneracy from primitive plainness conspicuous amongst Friends, both in dress and address, and the great need of a reformation; expressing his fervent desires for the restoration of ancient purity. He was himself an example of plainness, and in conversation cheerful, instructive, and edifying. He was often concerned to stir up the negligent to the performance of their duty, both as respected the attendance of meetings, and humble waiting therein.

He was fond of the company of faithful Friends, and very cheerfully entertained them. His Master, who supported him through the trials of his youth, did not forsake him, and, even in the decline of life, he bore some afflicting dispensations with Christian fortitude, looking to the recompense of reward. Thus preserved by his Lord, as a fruitful branch green to old age, he was a comfort to his friends, a refreshing to the church, and an example and encouragement to the humble-minded believers. His ministry was lively to the last, and in great sweetness of spirit he entered the valley of the shadow of death, beyond which he hoped to receive of the mercy of God in Christ Jesus, a mansion in everlasting blessedness.—*Anecdotes of Thomas Scattergood and his Times.*

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

EIGHT members of Parliament have been unseated for bribery.

—THE city of London has voted the freedom of the city to Henry Austin Layard, the author of the Researches at Nineveh.

—"Now a days," says the *Gateshead Observer*, "the vocalist must tell stories; the panoramic painter must sing songs; the musician must open his portfolio, and please with pictures 'children of all ages.' Lollipops are strewed on the road to learning; newspapers and magazines angle for subscribers with pencil cases and gold watches; and Saussure's 'ascent of Mont Blanc' gives place to Albert Smith's!"

—THE following singular epitaph was copied from a tomb in the parish churchyard of Pewsey, in Dorsetshire: "Here lies the body of Lady O'Looney, great niece of Burke, commonly called 'the Sublime;' she was bland, passionate and deeply religious; also she painted in water colours, and sent several pictures to the Exhibition; she was first cousin to Lady Jones, and of such is the kingdom of Heaven."

—Mr. Samuelson, of Banbury [Eng.], has recently produced and patented a new machine for digging. It is simple in construction, goes deeper than the plough by several inches, covering from two to three times its breadth, and reducing the land to a tilth equal to several ploughings and harrowings—in fact to trenching. It is equally effective in breaking up land for railway and other public works. The cost will not be more than from ten to fifteen pounds.

—BLACK BOYS SOLD IN LONDON.—There is a curious announcement in the *Critical Memoirs of the Times* for January, 1769, under the date of Tuesday, January 3—one, indeed, which is calculated to shock our present notions of what is right:—"There is an agent in town, we hear, purchasing a number of the finest, best made black boys, in order to be sent to Petersburg as attendants on her Russian Majesty."—*Notes and Queries.*

—CARDINAL WISEMAN asserted that among the things which mankind has received from the Popes is the mariner's compass. A writer in the *London Advertiser* undertakes to prove that the instrument was known before the Papal See was instituted, as follows: "In the 28th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles you will find further, as a matter of ordinary occurrence, that the compass was then in use. 'Paul sailing from Syracuse, *fetched a compass and came to Rhegium*;' so that before the blessing of the Popes was visited on us, in some rude shape or another this great boon of the sailor was familiar to those that 'went down to the sea in ships and did business on the great waters'"!!

—THERE is great talk again in the semi-official journals of Austria and Prussia, of a "strong note" addressed to the British Government on the subject of political refugees. It is even said that the three Northern Powers have agreed upon a joint remonstrance. All the strong notes of all the despotic Governments in the world cannot alter English law; and so long as there exists a free press in England, no Government would with impunity act as the spy, much less as the accomplice, of foreign tyranies.

—IN the translation of the works of Sadi just made by Mr. Eastwick, is a story upon which history has been little more than a pregnant commentary. "They relate that once, during a hunting expedition, they were preparing for Nushervan the Just some game, as roast meat. There was no salt, and they dispatched a slave to a village to bring some. Nushervan said, 'Pray for the salt you take, in order that it may not become a custom and the village be ruined.' They said, 'What harm will this little quantity do?' He replied, 'The origin of injustice in the world was at first small, but every one that came added to it, until it reached this present magnitude.'"

—THE probable origin of the saying "scraping acquaintance" is narrated by the *Gentleman's Magazine* for the present month. The Roman Emperor Hadrian, entering a bath, saw an old soldier scraping himself with a tile. He recognized the man as a former comrade, and ordered him a sum of money and a costly set of bathing garments. Thereupon all the old soldiers of the Imperial army became as anxious to claim fellowship with the Emperor as the Kirkpatricks are endeavouring to establish kinship with the Empress of the French. As Hadrian entered the bath one day after that on which he had rewarded his former comrade, he saw dozens of old soldiers scraping themselves with tiles. He understood the intent, but wittily evaded it. "Scrape one another, gentlemen," said he, "*you will not scrape acquaintance with me.*"

—LIFE.—We bring into the world with us a poor, needy, uncertain life, short at the longest, and unquiet at the best; all the imaginations of the witty and the wise have been perpetually busied to find out the ways how to revive it with pleasures, or relieve it with diversions—how to compose it with ease, and settle it with safety. To some of these ends have been employed the institutions of lawgivers, the reasonings of philosophers, the inventions of poets, the pains of labouring, and the extravagances of voluptuous men. All the world is perpetually at work about nothing else, but only that our poor mortal lives should pass the easier and happier for that little time we possess them, or else end the better when we lose them.

—RAILWAY MAXIMS.—*Perfectly at the Service of any Railway Company.*

Delays are dangerous
A Train in time saves nine.
Live and let live.
After a Railway excursion, the Doctor.
Do not halloo till you are out of the Train.
Between two Trains we fall to the ground.
Fire and Water make good Servants but bad Masters.
A Director is known by the Company he keeps.
A Railway Train is the Thief of Time.
There is no place like Home—but the difficulty is to get there.
The farther you go, the worse is your fare.
It's the Railway pace that kills.
The great charm about a Railway accident is that, no matter how many lives are lost, "no blame is ever attached to any one."
A Railway is long, but Life is short—and generally the longer a railway, the shorter your life.—*Punch.*

—GROTE AND MACAULAY IN FRANCE.—A writer in the London *Leader* says:

"The French Academy has been the scene of a contest more than usually interesting to Englishmen. The papers of last week, which merely indicated the fact of Macaulay's having been elected a member of the Academy, in place of Dr. Lingard, omitted, or were unacquainted with the most curious part of the occurrence. There were two candidates proposed, Grote and Macaulay—two names suggestive of very different claims to the honour, and such as would have puzzled an English Academy to decide upon. It was Guizot proposed Macaulay, and Tocqueville who proposed Grote. We presume personal friendship dictated this; otherwise one might feel surprised at Guizot's selecting a candidate whose brilliant qualities are so far removed from those which distinguished the *Histoire de la Civilization en Europe*. In France, Macaulay's reputation must have justified his election; if it were not justified by his nearer affinity to what Frenchmen have been taught to consider the true historic type. The brilliant style, and easy, yet abundant erudition of Macaulay, assimilate him more to the French type; while the laborious, deep-thinking, but somewhat cumbrous, work of Grote reminds us more of the German type.

—TURKEY AND THE APOCALYPSE.—Some of the clergy have set themselves to the study and exposition of the prophecies in the book of Daniel and the Apocalypse with regard to the Ottoman Empire, and their calculations run somewhat in this strain: The power of the Turk to continue ascendant over the third part of men for an hour, a day, a month, and a year, or 391 years and thirty days, began the 29th of May, 1453, when the Greek Empire was overthrown. That period ended on the 29th of June, 1844, or by a correction of the true year to make it coincide with the vulgar era, the 29th of June, 1848, the year in which the Russians invaded the Danubian provinces, and laid Constantinople open to their attack. Again, they find a period of 1290 years, during which the desolution of the land of Israel was to increase "until that determined shall be poured out on the desolator." The beginning of that period is supposed by them to coincide with Nousheerwan of Persia, in A. D. 531, and the end of it to have coincided with the year 1821, and the Greek revolt from the power of the Porte.

—WORKING MEN.—The expression, working class, or working men, must mean either those men who physically work without thinking, in which case it will not be very acceptable to those who arrogate it, and a wind or water mill, working day and night, would be the beau ideal of a working man, or it must mean men who work and think. But, if this is meant, who is not a working man, and who is? Is the physician who follows his vocation at any hour of the day, the lawyer who sits up late at night, the scholar who sacrifices his health to his science, a conscientious editor, whose work never rests, are all these, who rise much earlier and go to bed much later than those whose call themselves working men *par excellence*, no working men? Is a Humboldt, who braves, in the pursuit of his noble and chivalrous career, fever, beasts of prey, and insupportable insects, under a thousand privations—is a Champollion, who exposes himself to the burning sun of Egypt, to learn the lesson of the past—is a Parry, who dares the ices of the pole—a Davy, a Herschel, who enjoy no rest so regular, no health so sound, as that of any farmer—are not all these hard-working men? The division is entirely artificial and untenable; and, therefore, if acted upon, highly mischievous. It is to be regretted, then, that so fictitious a thing is made, not unfrequently, a ground of political division, as though the interests of those who apply their mind to the changing and moulding of materials were separated from those who consume their productions, or assist them essentially in discovering the best way of mastering the material.—*London Dispatch.*

—NEGROES IN JAMAICA.—Two negro gentlemen, members of the House of Assembly, dined at the King's House one night while we were there, at a grand dinner given by the governor. I was introduced to them, but in the crowd saw little of them. I did not sit near them at dinner, and altogether could form but a slight opinion of their manners and demeanour, but they appeared to be gentlemanlike and quiet, and not much, if at all, different from other people. A little while ago the captain of an American steamer gave a grand banquet on board his ship, and all the editors of the island were to be invited. The day arrived, and the guests made their appearance; but imagine the surprise of the captain, who was new to the customs of Jamaica, so different from those of even the free States of his own country, when two sable-complexioned editors made their appearance amongst the rest. The prejudices and opinions of the Americans must be well taken into account before the utter dismay and horror of the good captain can be comprehended and appreciated. However, there was nothing to be done but to submit to his dark destiny. He could not discard his own invited guests, so he made up his mind, shook the dusky hands graciously that were presented to him, and found the two *very* inky editors pleasing, well-informed, and well-conducted men. Even in repeating this tale to me (we came in his steamer from Chagres), the captain, who was an agreeable and gentlemanlike person, could hardly repress a light shudder of horror. I was told afterwards, at Jamaica, another circumstance relating to this very dinner, that, recollecting the dismay the editorial coloured presence had caused, rather amused me. Mystification and perplexities were evidently the order of the day. The guests, on arriving at the steamer, were, it appears, first received by the steward, who shook hands with each guest in the most free and easy manner. This, in America, I suppose, would be nothing out of the way; but here it was as much opposed to all existing etiquette as it would be in England. It seems probable, therefore, that the coloured gentlemen were as much surprised at this as their host was afterwards at themselves. What would the white steward think, if he was told these black guests thought shaking hands with him was a condescension on their parts? I had an interview with one of these negro editors some little time after, respecting some literary business, and found him a sensible and highly intelligent person. I believe his paper is one of the best conducted in Jamaica, free from the violence of party rancour and the vulgarity of personal abuse, which, from what I have heard, cannot be said of all the papers in the island. I believe this gentleman is also a member of the House of Assembly.—[illegible] *Et Cetera, by Lady Emeline Stuart Wortley.*